DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 262 UD 020 790

AUTHOR Cervenka, Edward J.; Rodriquez-Munoz, Juan
TITLE Final Evaluation Report on the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School, 1978-79.
INSTITUTION Community School District 4, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 31 Oct 79
GRANT G007503636
NOTE 91p.; For a related document see ED 181 121.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Bilingual Education; *English (Second Language); Junior High Schools; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Spanish; Spanish Speaking; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS *Bilingual Education Act 1968; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The Rafael Cordero Bilingual School (RCBS) provides a basic program in bilingual education for junior high school students. During the 1978-1979 school year, approximately 20% of enrolled students were English-dominant and 80% were Spanish-dominant. The program serves its major educational function as a way-station for bilingual students coming from bilingual elementary programs and prepares them for the challenges they will encounter in high school. The program included a staff development component and a program management component. Program evaluation was completed through pre-posttest student achievement data, attitude surveys, and evaluator observations. Evaluators concluded that the achievement of students at RCBS was quite satisfactory, staff development activities were viewed positively and assisted school personnel, and program management did not appear to improve over the previous year. Recommendations for future program implementation are included. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189262

F I N A L E V A L U A T I O N R E P O R T

on the

R A F A E L C O R D E R O B I L I N G U A L S C H O O L

1978 - 79

Partially Funded Under an ESEA
Title VII Grant for a Basic
Program of Bilingual Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared for:

Community School Board 4
NYC Community School District 4
319 East 117th Street
New York, New York 10035

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ron Edmonds
NYC Board of Ed
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Contact Person:

Nydia Novoa
Rafael Cordero Bilingual School
2351 First Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10035
Tel: (212) 534-5459

Grant No: G007503636

Prepared by:

Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D
Evaluation Consultant

and

Juan Rodriguez-Muñoz
Evaluation Consultant

October 31, 1979

VD020790

FOREWORD

If the reader wishes a condensed overview of the evaluation study findings and conclusions, the evaluators suggest that Section IV and V be read first. Otherwise, the reader may find it helpful to keep in mind the evaluators' logic in organizing the contents of this report on the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School during the 1978-79 academic year.

Section I, Program Description, gives descriptive and background information which places the evaluation study in context.

Section II, Evaluation Design, sets forth the evaluation plan for the program this year, as it was given in the Program's Continuation Application, in the evaluator's Outline of Proposed Evaluation and in other program documents which modified the evaluation plan for the 1978-79 school year.

Section III, Evaluation Findings, which constitutes the bulk of the report, presents specific evaluation findings on program objectives relating to student achievement, staff development and training and program management. With respect to the latter area, the report treats program management structure and processes. The evaluators emphasize that this study was not designed as an in-depth evaluation of classroom instruction. Findings relating to student achievement are presented mainly in statistical tables, with a minimum of interpretative commentary. Interview, observational, questionnaire and other findings pertaining to staff development and training and program management are described more comprehensively.

Whereas Section III presents a variety of data, derived from different sources and by different means of data collection, Section IV, Discussion and Interpretation of Findings, attempts to synthezise all data previously presented into a coherent whole, which represents the evaluators' best judgement about overall program accomplishments.

Section V, Conclusion and Recommendations, summarizes program accomplishments, comments on its promise and offers recommendations for strengthening the program in the future.

Appendices to this report contain copies of questionnaires used with School and District Administrators and bilingual program staff. Frequencies and percentages of responses on questionnaire surveys which were too detailed to report in Section III are recorded on the copies of apporpriate questionnaires. Appendices also include copies of the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students, the percentile norms for this scale, procedures for scoring the scale, and an outline of steps employed in the Bond and Singer method of analysis.

This evaluation study was a joint undertaking by the program staff and the evaluators. The evaluators wish to thank the program staff, particularly the Program Director, and also school and District administrators, for their cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
	List of Tables	iv
I.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
II.	EVALUATION DESIGN	5
III.	EVALUATION FINDINGS	12
	Student Achievement	12
	English Reading	12
	Spanish Reading	16
	Math Achievement in English	19
	Math Achievement in Spanish	25
	Student Attitude: Achievement Motivation	26
	Staff Development	31
	Program Management	34
IV.	DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS	41
	Student Achievement	41
	Staff Development and Training	51
	Program Management	51
	Overall Program Accomplishment	52
V.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	55
	APPENDICES	
	A. Questionnaire for School and District Administrators	58
	B. Questionnaire for Bilingual Program Staff	65
	C. Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students (English Version)	74
	D. Percentile Norms for Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students (Achievement Motivation)	77
	E. Procedures for Scoring Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students	78
	F. Procedures Employed in the Bond and Singer Method	82

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	English Reading Achievement, Seventh and Eighth Grade English-Dominant Students	14
2	English Reading Achievement, Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish-Dominant Students	15
3	Spanish Reading Achievement, Seventh and Eighth Grade English-Dominant Students	18
4	Spanish Reading Achievement, Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish-Dominant Students	20
5	Math Achievement in English, Seventh and Eighth Grade English-Dominant Students (Scores Not Available)	22
6	Math Achievement in English, Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish-Dominant Students (Incomplete Scores)	24
7	Math in Spanish, Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish-Dominant Students (Incomplete Scores)	27
8	Student Attitude: Achievement Motivation	29

SECTION I: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Rafael Cordero Bilingual School (RCBS) is an ESEA Title VII basic program of bilingual education located in New York City Community School District 4 in East Harlem or El Barrio. The Bilingual School currently occupies about one-third of the instructional facilities at JHS 45, which is located at 2351 First Avenue. The School has been designated as a model bilingual education program by the local community school district and also by the City of New York. In addition, the New York State Education Department has awarded the RCBS a Title VI-Part C Demonstration Grant, by which the State officially designates it as a model bilingual education program.

RCBS's educational program places great emphasis on flexible programming which takes into consideration the individual growth needs of each student. An important educational function of RCBS is that it serves as a way-station for bilingual children coming from bilingual programs in the elementary schools and prepares them for the difficulties and challenges of high school education. The program's Continuation Application called for 250 students to be served during the 1978-79 academic year. Approximately 310 students were served by the bilingual program at RCBS this year for varying periods of instruction, according to the evaluators' estimate.

The student body served by the RCBS consisted of approximately 20% English-dominant students and 80% Spanish-dominant students. In addition to the students mandated to participate in a bilingual program by the Aspira Consent Decree, children whose parents wished them to attend the School were also enrolled. Most of the English-dominant students were Puerto Rican or of

of other Hispanic origin and were Spanish-speaking, but with varying degrees of proficiency. The RCBS enrolls two distinct groups of "Spanish-dominant" students; one is comprised of Spanish-speaking children who are clearly Spanish-dominant in all language skills and in all domains of language use (e.g., home vs. school, academic study vs. social interaction with peers, speaking-understanding vs. reading and writing, etc.). These students tend to be fairly recent arrivals from Spanish-speaking countries, Puerto Rico and other areas. The second group is made up of students who appear dominant in Spanish in some language skills and in some domains of language use, and dominant in English in others. These students are mostly natives of the New York City area or long time residents. Some of these students have had prior schooling principally in programs having only all-English-speaking classrooms, though their home language is Spanish. Most of this category of students was mandated to be in programs of bilingual instruction by the Aspira Consent Decree.

The RCBS's educational program is comprised of the following components: Instructional, Staff Development and Training (the BETTER Program), Curriculum Materials Development, Parent and Community Involvement (the PEP Program), and a Guidance component. The instructional component contains several specialized subcomponents such as the BETA Program (Bilingual Education Through the Arts), which emphasizes media and media-related training, and the I-CAN Program (Instruction in Career Awareness Now), in addition to several minor ones.

The instructional component is based on homogeneous grouping in the seventh and eighth grades. Students are placed in

one of five groups by educational background and lingusitic ability. Each subject area is programmed to meet during the same class period in the day. This meets the need to individualize programs for students, as well as create greater flexibility in the design of the program. Students are grouped on the basis of an initial period of testing and diagnostic evaluation by teachers and staff. During the year they are re-evaluated by the staff and regrouped as often as is educationally necessary.

The RCBS is also organized into 10 official classes, which are heterogeneous in composition, providing for interaction between Spanish-dominant and English-dominant students. These groups serve as home room groups and also provide a context for instruction in secondary curriculum areas, e.g., art, music, recreation, guidance, and industrial and commercial arts.

The bilingual program staff and administrators participate in in-service training and staff development activities as a part of the BETTER Personnel component. Each staff member also has the opportunity to conduct workshops for the other members of the staff. In addition to the weekly workshops or training sessions, the teachers participate in weekend workshops aimed at developing skills in each of their subject area fields. They also matriculate in teacher-training programs at local universities. The overall goal of training and staff development is to enhance teacher and other instructional staff competencies, skills, understanding and attitudes so that staff can better perform their assigned duties in the program and thus achieve the goals and objectives of the instructional component.

The staff of the school during the 1978-79 academic year

consisted of the following personnel: Program Director, Assistant Program Director, Teacher Trainer, Guidance Counselor, two Media Specialists, a Secretary, 18 bilingual teachers and 6 paraprofessionals. This year the Program Director, a Media Coordinator, a Guidance Counselor, 4 Bilingual Resource Teachers and 6 paraprofessionals (including a Community Liaison person) were supported under ESEA Title VII funding.

SECTION II: EVALUATION DESIGN

Background to Design

The evaluation design for the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School for the 1978-79 academic year derives from the original design presented in the School's Program Application for the 1976-77 fiscal year, pages 94-117. The original design specified 20 performance objectives and associated evaluation procedures for academic and affective areas for Spanish-dominant and English-dominant students in the seventh and eighth grades. These objectives are listed below by title using the same numbers for objectives as appeared in the original evaluation design:

Seventh Grade English-Dominant:

1. English as a dominant language reading
2. Mathematics in the dominant language
3. Oral-aural Spanish as second language (1978-79 Spanish as a Second Language Reading)
4. Student attitude toward achievement

Seventh Grade Spanish-Dominant:

5. Spanish as a dominant language reading
6. Mathematics in the dominant language
7. Oral-aural English as a second language (1978-79 eliminated)
8. English as a second language reading
9. Mathematics in the second language
10. Student attitude toward achievement

Eighth Grade English-Dominant:

11. English as a dominant language
12. Mathematics in the dominant language
13. Oral-aural Spanish as a second language (1978-79 Spanish as a Second Language Reading)
14. Student attitude toward achievement

Eighth Grade Spanish-Dominant:

15. Spanish as a dominant language reading
16. Mathematics in the dominant language
17. Oral-aural English as a second language (1978-79, eliminated)
18. English as a second language reading
19. Mathematics in the second language
20. Student attitude toward achievement

Student objectives were to be assessed by pretest-posttest paradigms, except for the objectives pertaining to student attitudes toward achievement, which were assessed once at the end of the year.

The original 1976-77 evaluation design specified two performance objectives pertaining to staff development and training for bilingual teachers and paraprofessionals, vis.:

Staff Development:

21. Teacher and paraprofessional attitudes toward bilingual education, as measured by the Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory, which was developed during the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school years of the program (1978-79, eliminated).

22. Teacher and paraprofessional (participation) evaluation of training activities, i.e., pre-service, in-service, special workshops and university coursework

Since this evaluation design was originally proposed and implemented during the 1976-77 academic year it has been revised and modified, by program evaluators in collaboration with the Program Director, and with the approval of the Office of Bilingual Education, in order to:

1. Increase the design's effectiveness in estimating the bilingual program's instructional impact on students' academic skills.

2. Re-focus the design on the measurement of more educationally appropriate skills.

3. Eliminate measurements which were ineffective, either due to inadequate instruments or to the over-use of instruments.

4. Provide for the interpretation of student performance on certain objectives by mean of evaluator-developed local, "baseline" norms.

1978-79 Evaluation Design

Based on the aforementioned rationales, the evaluation for this academic year was to incorporate these changes in the original design, viz.:

Pages Affected in Original Design Given in 1976-77 Application	Revisions and Modifications Incorporated in 1978-79 Design
pp. 97-99, 112-113, 114	1. The Bond and Singer method (often called an "historical regression" analytic procedure) was introduced to analyze students' growth rates in reading and mathematics; this method, which provides for each student to serve as his/her own control, was employed to evaluate students' academic achievement in terms of objectives 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18 and 19 (For titles of objectives, refer to previous background subsection).

This change was made because no appropriate control or comparison groups could be found in the local school district nor in nearby local school districts.

pp. 105-106, 113-114 2. The content of objectives 3 and 13 was changed from "oral-aural Spanish as a second language" to "Spanish as a second language reading."

Spanish as a second language reading skills were considered to be more educationally relevant, as well as more effectively measured. This change in focus of objectives was indicated by the fact that in previous years seventh and eighth grade English-dominant students were performing beyond the effective range on several tests of oral-aural Spanish as a second language, and were being provided instruction in Spanish as a second language reading to a limited extent. These findings suggested that evaluation of Spanish reading skills would be more appropriate for these students.

pp. 105-106, 113-114 3. Objectives 7 and 17 pertaining to "oral-aural English as a second language" for Spanish-dominant students were eliminated.

No effective tests could be identified for these objectives. Tests designed for high school and college level students were tried and generally found to be somewhat difficult for the program's junior high school students; those tests available for the elementary grades were tried and found to be much too easy. Another instrument, which was used repeatedly, appeared to have lost its validity over time. Also the NYC LAB had to be eliminated as an evaluation instrument because it was used in selecting some students for the bilingual program.

pp. 100-101, 115 4. Objective 21 pertaining to teacher and paraprofessional attitudes toward bilingual education was eliminated.

The specific reason for this change was that teachers and paraprofessionals appeared to have become overly familiar with the content of the instrument, the Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory.

even though they consistently scored low on it in terms of locally developed norms. Also, it became evident that the RCBS's staff development and training activities were not geared specifically to the kinds of attitude changes which might have been assessed by this instrument. Realizing this, the Program Director and the evaluators decided during the 1977-78 to use this instrument as a training device, by administering it a final time and sharing and discussing the scaling system for the responses with program teachers.

5. Objectives 4, 10, 14 and 20 relating to students' attitudes toward achievement" were to be assessed by a single administration of the Attittude Scale for Bilingual Students/La Escala de Actitud para Estudiantes Bilingües.

   Students' results on this instrument were to be evaluated and interpreted by means of local percentile norms developed by the evaluators during the 1977-78 academic year. These norms consisted of three sets of norms: for English-dominant students, for Spanish-dominant students, and for students having "mixed dominance" -- largely the students placed in the program by the Aspira Consent Decree.

6. One new objective, Objective 23 dealing with program management, was introduced into the 1978-79 evaluation design.

   The 1977-78 evaluation recommended that the evaluation design for the following year include a "significant management process component." The evaluators stated, "It appears...that the great increase in the size of the program, both in terms of students and staff, has created a need for a fuller examination, and perhaps a re-organization, of all aspects of program management." The new objective dealt with "program management effectiveness."

New Program Management Objective

The RCBS administrative staff will improve the effectiveness of bilingual program management processes (e.g., planning,

personnel management, communication, formulation of goals and objectives, leadership/management style, decision-making/policy formulation, delegation of authority, scheduling, management of instruction, office operation and efficiency, etc.), as assessed at the end of the year by positive evaluations of management processes made by the program staff and school and District administrators on end-of-the-year questionnaire surveys. Assessment of this objective will also rely on corroborative interview and observational findings obtained by the evaluators.

The evaluators' approach to the evaluation of program management, particularly in their interviews and on-site observations of administrative and instructional staff, was to follow a series of procedures:

1. Describe the management or organizational structure of the RCBS and the larger school and District structure in which it is situated, e.g., as would be described in an organizational chart indicating duties and roles, lines of authority, lines of communication, advisory lines, technical and resource lines, etc.

2. From this structure, identify the major or significant management processes involved in the operation or implementation of the bilingual education program during the 1978-79 school year.

3. Attempt to identify factors within and without the program which tend to <u>hinder</u> or <u>enhance</u> the effectiveness of management processes.

4. Analyze the factors which hinder or enhance the effectiveness of program management processes and attempt to find solutions for ineffective management processes; and on this basis make recommendations to the Program administrative staff, both on-going during the year and/or at the termination of the year in the final evaluation report.

Format for Reporting Results

The following section of this report, Section III: Evaluation Findings, reports the 1978-79 evaluation findings resulting from the implementation of this evaluation design. Within Section III, immediately proceding the reporting of findings, the applicable evaluation performance objectives are re-stated in a fuller form. The original proposed evaluation design in the program Application for 1976-77 should be consulted for a complete specification of evaluation procedures, instrument descriptions, data collection and analysis procedures, etc. Section IV, Discussion and Interpretation of Findings, discusses and interprets evaluation results at greater length, and findings pertaining to various grade and language groups are brought together. Generally Section IV attempts to sythesize data previously presented in Section III into a conherent whole, which represents the evalutors' best judgement about overall program accomplishments. Section V: Conclusion and Recommendations summarizes program accomplishments, comments on program promise and offers recommendations for strengthening the bilingual education program at the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School.

SECTION III: EVALUATION FINDINGS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

English Reading

Objectives 1 and 11

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade English dominant students (Objective 1) and to eighth grade English dominant students (Objective 11) will result in improvement in English reading skills, as measured by the CAT Reading Test; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total reading score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 1 (page 14) gives the results of analyses of English reading achievement relating to Objectives 1 and 11. As shown on the right of Table 1, neither the seventh grade nor eighth grade English dominant students achieved their performance objectives for English reading as they were stated above, i.e., in terms of the Bond and Singer analysis. This finding suggests that if these two groups of students had not been exposed to the bilingual instruction program, and if they had continued to progress in English reading at the same rates of growth as in previous years of schooling, they would have achieved approximately the same level of achievement.

However, as shown on the left of Table 1, the seventh graders obtained a pretest grade equivalent mean of 6.6 (SD = 1.51) and an actual posttest mean of 7.7 (SD = 1.82), with $t = 5.759$ and $P < .001$. In other words, on the weaker analysis of

achievement (the pretest-posttes comparison), the group made a statistically significant improvement. The group advanced 1.1 G.E.'s, from 6.6. to 7.7. G.E.'s.

A similar pattern of achievement was found for the eighth graders; however, they closely approached the criterion of the stated objective, i.e., a $P = .10$ as compared to the expected $P \leq .05$. On the pretest-posttest analysis the group made a significant improvement. The group had a pretest mean of 7.4 G.E.'s (SD = 1.61) and a posttest mean of 8.9 (SD = 1.55), with $t = 6.767$ and $P < .001$. The group advanced 1.5 G.E.'s during the 1978-79 academic year, and by the end of the year they were reading on grade level

Objective 8 and 18

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 8) and to eighth grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 18) will result in improvement in English as a second language reading skills, as measured by the CAT Reading Test; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total reading score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 2 (page 15) shows the results of analyses of English as a second language reading achievement pertaining to Objectives 8 and 18. As indicated pn the right of Table 2, the Bond and Singer analyses show that the seventh graders did not achieve their objective as stated, but that the eighth graders did

TABLE 1

ENGLISH READING ACHIEVEMENT

Seventh and Eighth Grade English-Dominant Students

CAT Grade Equivalent Scores
Total Score Analyses

ENGLISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest/Posttest Analysis: Pretest, CAT Reading Test Levels 17 & 18, Form D — Pretest	Pretest/Posttest Analysis: Posttest, CAT Reading Test Levels 17 & 18, Form C — Actual Posttest	Bond and Singer Analysis: Posttest, CAT Reading Test Levels 17 & 18, Form C — Expected Posttest
7th Grade (Objective 1)	N	24	24	24
	M	6.6	7.7	7.7
	SD	1.51	1.82	1.82
	t	5.759	.282	
	P	<.001	.219	
				(Not Met)
8th Grade (Objective 11)	N	29	29	29
	M	7.4	8.9	8.5
	SD	1.61	1.55	1.88
	t	6.767	1.701	
	P	<.001	.100	
				(Not Met)

TABLE 2

ENGLISH READING ACHIEVEMENT

Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students

CAT Grade Equivalent Scores
Total Score Analyses

SPANISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest/Posttest Analysis: Pretest, CAT Reading Test Levels 17 & 18, Form D — Pretest	Pretest/Posttest Analysis: Posttest, CAT Reading Test Levels 17 & 18, Form C — Actual Posttest	Bond and Singer Analysis: Posttest, CAT Reading Test Levels 17 & 18, Form C — Expected Posttest
	N	64	64	64
	M	4.5	5.4	5.2
7th Grade	SD	.94	1.13	1.13
(Objective 8)	t	6.376	1.222	
	P	<.001	.266	(Not Met)
	N	77	77	77
	M	5.2	6.4	5.9
8th Grade	SD	1.30	1.69	1.53
(Objective 18)	t	7.132	2.592	
	P	<.001	.011	(Met)

achieve their stated objective in English as a second language reading.

As shown on the left of Table 2, both the seventh and eighth graders made statistically significant improvements in mean scores. The seventh graders had a pretest mean of 4.5 G.E.'s (SD = .94) and a posttest mean of 5.4 (SD = 1.13), with $t = 6.376$ and $P < .001$. The eighth graders obtained a pretest mean of 5.2 (SD = 1.30) and a posttest mean of 6.4 (SD = 1.69), with $t = 7.132$ and $P < .001$. Thus, the seventh graders advanced .9 G.E.'s during the academic year (i.e., almost a full year's normal growth), and the eighth graders advanced 1.2 G.E.'s or more than a full year's normal growth. However, in terms of these norms (which are based on the scores of English-speaking children in the U.S.) both groups were exactly 2.5 G.E.'s below the norms at the end of the academic year.

Spanish Reading

Objectives 3 and 13

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade English dominant students (Objective 3) and to eighth grade English dominant students (Objective 13) will result in improvement in Spanish reading skills, as measured by the IAS Prueba de Lectura, Level III; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total reading score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 3 (page 18) gives analyses of Spanish as a second language reading achievement as it relates to Objectives 3 and 13. As shown on the right of Table 3, the Bond and Singer analyses indicated that the seventh graders did not attain their objective as stated, but that the eighth graders did achieve their objective for Spanish reading.

The pretest-posttest analyses of both seventh and eighth graders show that both groups made statistically significant improvements in mean scores during the year. The seventh grade had a pretest mean of 5.7 G.E.'s (with SD = 1.73) and a posttest mean of 6.7 (SD = 2.09) with t = 3.139 and P = .006. The seventh graders thus advanced 1.0 G.E. or made normal progress in Spanish reading during the year. At the end of the year, they were 1.2 G.E.'s below norm, i.e., norms based on the scores of Spanish-speaking children in Puerto Rico.

The eighth graders obtained a pretest mean of 4.6 (SD = 1.71) and a posttest mean of 6.7 (SD = 1.55), with t = 4.651 and P < .001. The group made 2.1 G.E.'s progress during the year, i.e., a gain of more than two years in reading growth. At the end of the year the group was reading 2.2. G.E.'s below Puerto Rican reading norms.

Objectives 5 and 15

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 5) and to eighth grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 15) will result in improvement in Spanish reading skills, as measured by the IAS Prueba de Lectura, Level III; such improvement being demonstrated by

TABLE 3

SPANISH READING ACHIEVEMENT

Seventh and Eighth Grade English-Dominant Students

Inter-American Series, Prueba de Lectura
Grade Equivalent Scores, Total Score Analysis

		Pretest/Posttest Analysis		Bond and Singer Analysis
		Pretest, IAS Prueba de Lectura Level 3, Form CEs	Posttest, IAS Prueba de Lectura Level 3, Form DEs	
SPANISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest	Actual Posttest	Expected Posttest
	N	19	19	19
	M	5.7	6.7	6.5
7th Grade	SD	1.73	2.09	2.03
(Objective 3)	t	3.139	.445	
	P	.006	.338	
				(Not Met)
	N	15	15	15
	M	4.6	6.7	5.2
8th Grade	SD	1.71	1.55	2.00
(Objective 13)	t	4.651	2.985	
	P	<.001	.009	
				(Met)

a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total reading score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 4 (page 20) gives analyses of Spanish as a dominant language reading achievement as it relates to Objectives 5 and 15. As indicated on the right of Table 4, the Bond and Singer analyses show that both the seventh and eighth graders achieved their objectives for Spanish reading. Both groups also demonstrated statistically significant improvements in mean scores on pretest-posttest analyses.

The seventh graders had a pretest mean of 4.2 G.E.'s (SD = 2.01) and a posttest mean of 5.3 G.E.'s (SD = 1.95) with $t=6.388$ and $P < .001$. The seventh grade Spanish-dominant students thus advanced 1.1 grade equivalents during the year and at the end of the year were 2.6 G.E.'s below the norms of Spanish-speaking readers in Puerto Rico.

The eighth graders had a pretest mean of 5.0 G.E.'s (SD = 1.63) and a posttest mean of 5.9 G.E.'s (SD = 1.95), with $t = 6.417$ and $P < .001$. The eighth grade Spanish-dominant students thus advanced .9 grade equivalents during the year and at the end of the year were 3.0 G.E.'s below the norms of Spanish-speaking readers in Puerto Rico.

Math in English

Objectives 2 and 12

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade English dominant students (Objective 2) and to eighth grade

TABLE 4

SPANISH READING ACHIEVEMENT

Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish-Dominant Students

Inter-American Series, Prueba de Lectura
Grade Equivalent Scores, Total Score Analysis

		Pretest/Posttest Analysis		Bond and Singer Analysis
		Pretest, IAS, Prueba de Lectura	Posttest, IAS Prueba de Lectura	
SPANISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest	Actual Posttest	Expected Posttest
	N	72	72	72
	M	4.2	5.3	4.8
7th Grade	SD	2.01	1.95	2.35
(Objective 5)	t	6.388	2.951	
	P	<.001	.004	
				(Met)
	N	86	86	86
	M	5.0	5.9	5.6
8th Grade	SD	1.63	1.95	1.89
(Objective 15)	t	6.417	2.344	
	P	<.001	.021	
				(Met)

English dominant students (Objective 12) will result in improvement in math skills, as measured by the CAT Math Test, Advanced Level; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total math score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

No math scores were returned to the RCBS or to the evaluators from the District (and the NYC Board of Education) for English-dominant seventh grade students (instructional group 17) nor for the English-dominant eighth grade students (instruction group 18); consequently math achievement for these groups could not be evaluated.

Objectives 9 and 19

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 9) and to eighth grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 19) will result in improvement in math skills in English, as measured by the CAT Math Test, Advanced Level; such improvement demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total math score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 6 (page 24) gives results pertaining to the math achievement in English of the seventh and eighth grade Spanish-dominant students, Objectives 9 and 19 respectively. The analyses of the math achievement for these grades could only partially be carried out, because of incomplete scores. Posttest

TABLE 5

MATH ACHIEVEMENT IN ENGLISH

Seventh and Eighth Grade English-Dominant Students

SAT Grade Equivalent Scores

Total Score Analysis

ENGLISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS	Pretest, SAT Math Test Advanced Level, Form A	Posttest, SAT Math Test Advanced Level, Form B
7th Grade (Objective 2)	SCORES NOT AVAILABLE	
8th Grade (Objective 12)	SCORES NOT AVAILABLE	

CAT scores were provided only for Spanish-dominant instructional groups 3, 4 and 5 at both the seventh and eighth grade levels. These are summarized in Table 6. No posttest scores were provided to the evaluators for the Spanish-dominant students in instructional group 2 at either grade level. The evaluators note that, at each grade level, instructional group 2 has in previous years had the the highest achievers in English math. For both grade levels, no individual pretest scores (actually posttest scores from May 1978) could easily be retrieved. The evaluators were under the impression that the program had them; the program was under the impresssion that the evaluators had them. In any case, math scores were available neither for the Bond and Singer analyses nor the pretest-posttest analyses.

Descriptive statistics for the math achievement of Spanish-dominant seventh graders in instructional groups 3, 4 and 5 only are given in the upper half of Table 6. These students obtained a G.E. mean of 5.0, with SD = .97. Last year, the Spanish-dominant seventh graders (including instructional group 2) scored a mean of 4.8 G.E.'s, with SD = 1.10. It is to be emphasized that this is a <u>different</u> seventh grade (actually the present eight grade).

Descriptive statistics for the math achievement of Spanish-dominant eighth graders in instructional groups 3, 4 and 5 only are given in the lower half of Table 6. These students obtained a G.E. mean of 5.2, with SD = 1.18. Last year, the Spanish-dominant eighth graders (including instructional group 2) obtained a mean of 5.6 G.E.'s, with SD = 1.22; again, it is to be emphasized that this is a different eighth grade (the one

TABLE 6

MATH ACHIEVEMENT IN ENGLISH

Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish-Dominant Students
(Excluding Instructional Groups 2^7 and 2^8)

SAT, Grade Equivalent Scores
Total Score Analyses

SPANISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest, SAT Math Test Advanced Level, Form A		Posttest, SAT Math Test Advanced Level, Form B	
		Pretest		Actual Posttest	Expected Posttest
	N	NA*		30	---
7th Grade	M	NA*		5.0	---
(Instructional Groups 3^7, 4^7 and 5^7 only)	SD	NA*		.97	---
(Objective 9)	t		---	---	
	P		---	---	
				(No Determination Possible)	
	N	49**		69	---
8th Grade	M	4.8**		5.2	---
(Instructional Groups 3^8, 4^8, and 5^8 only)	SD	1.10**		1.18	---
(Objective 19)	t		---	---	
	P		---	---	
				(No Determination Possible)	

* NA = Scores not available to evaluators

** Means and Standard Deviations reported for comparison purposes only; no analyses were possible because no individual test scores were available to the evaluators.

which went on to senior high school). As noted previously, the present eighth graders (including the high-scoring instructional group 2) scored a mean of 4.8, with an SD of 1.1., as seventh graders in May 1978.

The partial scores for both grades indicated that the Spanish-dominant seventh graders were performing in English math 2.8 G.E.'s below norms for native English-speaking students and the Spanish-dominant eighth graders were performing in English math 3.0 G.E.'s below the same norms.

Math in Spanish

Objectives 6 and 16

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 6) and to eighth grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 16) will result in improvement in math skills in Spanish, as measured by the Prueba de Aprovechamiento en Matemáticas; such improvement being demonstated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total math score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest and posttest scores.

Findings

The analysis of seventh grade math achievement in Spanish (Objective 6) could not be carried out because no pretest was administered in June 1978 (when these students were sixth graders). Also, no posttest scores for the seventh graders were provided to the evaluators.

The analysis for objective 16 could not be implemented as planned because there insufficient correlated scores, i.e.,

between the June 1978 "pretest" and the June 1979 "posttest". As an alternative, the evaluators compared 1978 posttest scores and 1979 posttest scores on the Prueba de Aprovechamiento en Matemáticas, using an independent t-test.

As shown in Table 7 (page 27) the eighth grade Spanish-dominant students appeared to have achieved their objective in Math in Spanish. As seventh graders, 24 students obtained a raw score mean of 22.4 (SD = 7.0), and as eighth graders, 18 students made a raw score mean of 27.2 (SD = 9.4), with t = 1.987 and P = .054.

Student Attitude: Achievement Motivation

Objectives 4, 10, 14 and 20

Instruction provided in the I-CAN (Instruction in Career Awareness Now) and the BETA (Bilingual Education Through the Arts) programs, and the bilingual education program generally of the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School, will result in "positive student attitudes" after one year of participation and "strongly positive student attitudes" after two years of participation, as determined by the end-of-the year scores on the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students (English and Spanish versions; see Appendix C for English version).

Revision of Criteria

The performance criteria of these objectives, which indicate that instruction would result in "positive student attitudes" after one year of participation and "strongly positive students attitudes" after two years of participation, were proposed when the instrument and its interpretative uses were undergoing

TABLE 7

MATH ACHIEVEMENT IN SPANISH

Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish-Dominant Students

Prueba de Aprovechamiento en Matemáticas

Raw Scores, Total Score Analyses

		1977-78 Posttest	1978-79 Posttest
SPANISH-DOMINANT 7th Grade (Objective 6)	N	NO PRETEST CARRIED OUT FOR GROUP AS 6th GRADERS	NO POSTTEST SCORES MADE AVAILABLE
	M		
	SD		
	t		
	P		
		(No Determination Possible)	
SPANISH-DOMINANT 8th Grade (Objective 16)	N	25	18
	M	22.4	27.2
	SD	7.0	9.4
	$t_{(i)}$	1.987	
	P	.054	
		(Objective Met)	

development. The current applicable criteria (See Section II: Evaluation Design, page 9) are that each language dominance group, i.e., English-dominant and Spanish-dominant (with "Mixed dominance" included in Spanish-dominant group), score at or above the 50th percentile their respective norms. These norms were based on the performance of 215 seventh and eighth grade students in the program during the 1976-77 school year (See Appendix D for Percentile Norms). These norms combine seventh and eighth grade scores since there was found to be no significant difference in performance across grades. Scoring of the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students is illustrated in Appendix E and the rationale for scoring and constructing norms is explained in the Final Evaluation Report 1977-78, pp. 20-21.

Findings

In June 1979 the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students was administered to 142 students at the RCBS. Students were tested in their dominant language or stronger language -- generally this was left to teacher judgment. Table 8 (page 29) provides descriptive statistics on student response on the instrument by grade and language dominance group. In addition, statistics for the Spanish-dominant seventh and eighth grades have been broken down into two sub-groups: students who are dominant in Spanish in all domains of language use (recent arrivals) and students who appear to be English-dominant in some domains of language use. The latter group is made up primarily of "Aspira" students, who are generally long term residents of the New York City area and who have had exposure to instruction in English during previous years of schooling, but whose home language

TABLE 8
STUDENT ATTITUDE: ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION
Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students
June 1979 Administration

	(Objective 4)	(Objective 10)		
	English-Dominant	Spanish-Dominant	Combined Spanish-Speaking Groups	Mixed Dominance
SEVENTH GRADE	N = 23	N = 17	N = 55	N = 38
	M = 55.7	M = 59.6	M = 58.0	M = 57.0
	SD = 5.38	SD = 3.37	SD = 4.58	SD = 4.90
	Interpretation of Seventh Grade Group Means			
	E-Norms[1] = 47%ile	E-Norms = 58%ile	E-Norms = 47%ile	E-Norms = 42%ile
	S-Norms = 56%ile	S-Norms = 75%ile	S-Norms = 56%ile	S-Norms = 48%ile
	M-Norms = 62%ile	M-Norms = 76%ile	M-Norms = 62%ile	M-Norms = 58%ile
	(Objective 14)	(Objective 20)		
	English-Dominant	Spanish-Dominant	Combined Spanish-Speaking Groups	Mixed Dominance
EIGHTH GRADE	N = 24	N = 14	N = 40	N = 26
	M = 58.7	M = 61.5	M = 56.7	M = 54.1
	SD = 6.54	SD = 4.88	SD = 7.56	SD = 7.54
	Interpretation of Eighth Grade Group Means			
	E-Norms[1] = 55%ile	E-Norms = 65%ile	E-Norms = 42%ile	E-Norms = 28%ile
	S-Norms = 60%ile	S-Norms = 86%ile	S-Norms = 48%ile	S-Norms = 25%ile
	M-Norms = 71%ile	M-Norms = 84%ile	M-Norms = 59%ile	M-Norms = 44%ile

[1] The three sets of norms for the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students are given in Appendix D. English-Dominant (E-Norms) are based on the administration of the English version of the Scale to English-dominant students in the seventh and eighth grades in June 1977. Spanish-Dominant (S-Norms) are based on the administration of the Spanish version to Spanish-dominant seventh and eighth graders in June 1977. Mixed Dominance Norms (M-Norms) are based on the administration of the English or Spanish versions of the Scale to seventh and eighth grade students of "mixed" language dominance (generally this group included "Aspira" students), also in June 1977. This latter group is labeled "mixed dominance" because it can function more effectively in English in some domains of language use and more effectively in Spanish in others. Even though the Scale was presented to students orally as well as by written materials, most students in this "mixed dominance" group took the English version of it.

generally remains in Spanish or Spanish and English.

As shown in Table 8, the English-dominant and Spanish-dominant students (with the so-called "mixed dominance" group both as a part of, and as separate from, the Spanish-dominant group) made scores near or substantially above their respective norms; moreover, the variability of their scores (as indicated by standard deviations) appears low. Assuming validity for the scale, this finding would suggest that the program was successful in affecting students' achievement motivations, somewhat more so for the Spanish-dominant and mixed dominance groups. In terms of the percentile norms for the Scale, the two Spanish-speaking groups performed substantially above their appropriate norms, viz., Spanish-Dominant - S-Norms = 75%ile; Mixed Dominance - M-Norm = 58%ile. The English-dominant group obtained a total mean score on the scale which fell at the 47%ile, suggesting perhaps a slightly lowered level of achievement motivation.

As is indicated in Table 8, the English-dominant eighth graders scored somewhat higher than the English-dominant seventh graders. The Spanish-dominant group scored higher, and the mixed-dominance group scored lower than its seventh grade counterparts. Looking at their mean scores in terms of the percentile, norms for the Scale, the achievement motivation of the English and Spanish dominant students appears quite high; that of the mixed-dominant group quite low, i.e., 28%ile on their own norms.

In summary, the English-dominant and Spanish-dominant groups in the program appeared to demonstrate fairly high and uniform achievement motivation, viz., attitudes toward school,

education, work and future careers. The Spanish-dominant group showed more positive attitudes, and the English-speaking group less positive ones, in terms of the norms for the Scale. The "mixed dominance" subgroup of the Spanish-dominant students in the eighth grade demonstrated a low level of achievement motivation as measured by the Scale and as interpreted by norms appropriate to that subgroup.

Staff Development

Objective 21

Training and other staff development activities provided to teachers and paraprofessionals by the program during the 1978-79 school year will result in the improvement of "professional" attitudes, i.e., their attitudes toward teacher-student relationships, language and bilingualism, culture and pluriculturalism, theory and methods of bilingual education and teacher-parent-school-community relationships, as measured by the Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory (BTAI).

Findings

This procedure was eliminated from the evaluation by mutual agreement of the evaluators and the Program Director. (See Section II: Evaluation Design).

Objective 22

Staff development and training activities provided by the school will by the end of the academic year result in a positive assessment of such activities by the instructional staff, as determined by end-of-the-year questionnaire survey. A "positive assessment" was to be defined as a substantial

majority of the staff responding (67% or more) expressing a positive evaluation on speific rating scales pertaining to all major staff development and training activities. Supplementary information bearing on the attainment of the staff development and training objective was to be obtained by end-of-the-year questionnaire survey of school and district administrators.

Findings

The tabulated data for the program staff opinion questionnaire used for this objective are given in full in Appendix B. Supplementary information from the questionnaire survey of school and district administrators is given in Appendix A.

Thirteen of 25 bilingual program staff members completed and returned questionnaires dealing with staff development and training (See Appendix B).

Seventy-five percent of the respondents indicated that pre-service (including summer) training provided by the program this year was "not applicable" to them or that they "did not participate" in such training. The remaining 25% of the respondents reported that such training was "helpful" or "very helpful" in enabling them to carry out their assigned duties in the program. (Question #6).

Fifty-eight percent of the program staff respondents reported that the in-service training provided by the program "was not applicable" to them or that they "did not participate" in it. The remaining 42% found such training "helpful" or "very helpful".

In the opinion of the program staff, 42% found the special (one day or short-term) workshops conducted by the program to

be "helpful" or "very helpful." Eight percent (one individual) found these workshops to be "unhelpful." Fifty percent of the respondents indicated that these workshops were "not applicable" to them or that they "did not participate" in them. (#8).

With respect to university courses provided under ESEA Title VII funding, half of the respondents thought they had been "helpful" or "very helpful" in preparing them to carry out their assigned duties in the program. The other respondents indicated that these courses were "not appropriate" for themselves or that they "did not participate" in them. The university courses taken by the program staff this year included courses in: Constrastive Analysis of English and Spanish, Advanced Psychology, Spanish Practicum, Educational Problems in Metropolitan Areas, Theory and Practice of Bilingual Education and Research Methods for Bilingual Education.

Four respondents returned questionnaires for school and District administrators. (See Appendix A). However, three of these four were members of the administrative staff of the bilingual program; only one respondent was a district administrator.

The group rated the instructional competence of the bilingual program teachers (which can be viewed as a consequence of training and staff development activities) to be somewhat more than a "slight problem," i.e., their rating fell between a "slight problem" and "a moderately serious problem." The instructional personnel was rated as only a "slight problem." (Question #8).

All four respondents indicated that if there had been no bilingual education program funded under ESEA Title VII this year, "much less" training and staff development activities would have occured. (Question #8).

In terms of the evaluations of those who participated in program staff development and training activities, Objective 22 was achieved.

However, half or more the instructional staff at the RCBS did not participate in the various staff development and training activities provided by the program. Those who did participate in these activities viewed them positively (as "helpful" or "very helpful") and as having enabled them to carry out their assigned duties in the program. The program and district administrators appeared to view the effects of training (i.e, on staff instructional competence) as less than optimal.

Program Management

Objective 23

The RCBS administrative staff will improve the effectiveness of bilingual program management processes. (See specification of objective 23 in Section II Page 9).

Findings

The evaluators found that the management or organizational structure of the RCBS, as well as the larger school and District structure within which it was situated, provided an excellent context for implementing a bilingual education program at the junior high level. The program at RCBS functioned -- to a much greater degree than is the case with most bilingual education programs -- as a separate entity, with its principal lines of authority and communication coming from the District Office and the New York City Board of Education. Within the RCBS, the evaluators found that there was in place a distinct and useful organization of administrative staff and instructional staff.

An attempt had been made in the previous year to develop written specifications for the duties of most positions in the school. These appear to be beneficial, but need completion and further refinement.

Despite what would appear to be a very satisfactory organizational structure in which to function, the operation of the bilingual program at the RCBS seemed to be beset by several small managerial problems. These stem most frequently from lack of effective communication and information dissemination (e.g., at staff meetings), from a need to clarify policies and rules, and from a need to formulate goals and objectives. In general however, the evaluators found the management processes of the program to be quite effective. It appeared to the evaluators somewhat unfortunate that the instructional staff and the administrators of the program did not realize how ideal their situation was for implementing a bilingual program. The evaluators believe that the RCBS and staff are at a point where a training intervention is called for, one that is directed at administrators and non-administrators and aims to increase awareness of management processes and increase their effectiveness. Such a training intervention is likely to produce greatly increased job satisfaction among the RCBS staff.

Th twelve individuals who completed the questionnaire items relating to program management (See Appendix B) included nine teachers, one paraprofessional and two "technical, resource or specialist" personnel (Question #1). Besides teaching or administration, staff members listed their main duties as conferring with parents and participating in regular staff meetings (#2). All but three of the twelve respondents had been in their

current positions at least two years (#3) and all of them had been in bilingual education for at least two years (#4).

The program staff members responding to the questionnaire found that a number of program management processes lacked "effectiveness" during the 1978-79 academic year. These included leadership, management style, decision-making, policy formulation, delegation of authority, communication with non-Program staff, group problem-solving, internal evaluation, and program grievance and input procedures. They saw these areas of program management as in "more than moderate need" of improvement (#11).

The respondents reported that most program directives and other information were communicated via staff meetings and memos (#12). The staff seemed to be divided on the matter of how frequently they communicated or conferred with the Program Director and other administrative staff, some saying frequently and other infrequently (#13). Most of the staff found that staff conferences and other meetings held during the year only "slightly useful and informative." (#14). The respondents felt that program needs assessments, internal evaluations and program modification were initiated more frequently by the teachers and the technical staff and less frequently by program administrators. (#15). Half of the respondents indicated that the 1978-79 bilingual program could be "an advantage to the school system" if it were improved in certain ways, while the other half felt it was " a definitive advantage to the school system" this year (#25). All twelve of the respondents indicated that they would like to see the Bilingual Program at RCBS continued next year and in subsequent years (#26). One staff member suggested that

the program be moved to a new site. Under recommendations for improving the program in the future the program staff members suggested more and better planning, more teacher and staff input, a unified program policy (as relating to rules, discipline, etc.), more inovlvement in the program by the Assistant Director, more communication between program administrators and instructional staff, the discontinuation of preferential treatment of some staff members, strengthening of staff morale and handling staff members' problems on an individual basis.

With regard to the management of staff development and training, those staff members who did participate in training activities generally thought they were "very helpful" and "well-organized" (#6, #7, #8 and #9). The areas in which the respondents indicated that they had "more than a moderate" need for additional professional preparation in bilingual education were: English Language Arts, Career Awareness Instruction/ Vocational Training for Bilingual Students, bilingual education through the arts and improvement of students' self-esteem through bilingual education (#10).

Two staff members recommended that more training be made available for teachers and administrators in vocational and career training.

With regard to the management of instruction (i.e., those functions affecting instruction other than teaching), the instructional staff appeared adequately satisfied.

About half of the respondents thought program selection and/or grouping procedures might be improved by using more effective or appropriate tests, more effective or appropriate

assessment procedures, and more input from program teachers. (#16). All but three of the respondents participated to some extent in the selection procedures (#17). One recommendation was that classes should be more heterogeneous. Respondents were split in their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with selection and grouping procedures for program students (#18). Most of the staff respondents did not participate at all in "mainstreaming" of students from the program, since students generally left the program at the end of the eighth grade (#19). Of those who did have an opinion on mainstreaming of students, they were almost equally divided between those who were satisfied with these procedures and those who where not satisfied (#20). The most popular suggestions for improving the exit or mainstreaming criteria were to use more effective or appropriate assessment procedures and to use more input from program teachers (#21).

In rating the quality and quantity of instructional materials provided by the program, seven of the 12 found them to be "adequate" and "appropriate," while five staff members rated them as "inadequate" or "inappropriate" (#22). One teacher stated that most of her social studies classes were taught in Spanish and there were hardly any appropriate books or materials available at the reading level of her students. Two staff members suggested a better curriculum be created to meet the students' needs and that more Spanish materials be acquired. Most staff members indicated that they had been provided with inadequate information to order sufficient and appropriate materials for the 1978-79 academic year (#23). One teacher commented that the students' needs had not been discussed that the teachers

had only been given students' reading and math scores.

Three-fourths of the respondents characterized the program as effective in involving parents in the program (#24).

The four program and district administrator respondents (See Appendix A) characterized the benefits that students derived from participation in the program as either "important" or "essential." One respondent commented that culture was stressed and that second language use was fostered outside of the formal classroom setting (#6). Two of the respondents thought that program students should continue to spend the amount of time they are currently spending in the program classes, while the other two thought program class time should be increased (#7). In evaluating possible problem areas in the operation of the bilingual program at RCBS, the respondents found these to be: adequacy of instructional space, cooperation between program teachers and other teachers in the JHS, and the integration of bilingual program students and non-bilingual program students for non-academic classes (#8).

The general consensus was that no provision had been made for regular meetings and/or workshops between program teachers and other teachers in the JHS for purpose of exchanging information, instructional materials and techniques (#9). Three of the respondents thought that the bilingual program at RCBS had "substantially" increased parental involvement in school affairs, while the fourth did not know (#11). Most of the administrator respondents felt that parents of program students were "somewhat aware" of the special goals, rationales and benefits of the bilingual program (#12).

The four administrator respondents indicated that program operation and implementation suffered due to certain ineffective program processes or functions. These included: feedback to subordinates and supervisors, management of instruction, and space and time utilization management (#13). All four indicated that they communicated "very frequently" or "frequently" with the program staff about the program (#13) and that they observed these communications to be "moderately useful and informative" (#15). Three of the administrators thought the bilingual program at RCBS was a "definitive advantage" to their school system, while the fourth stated that the program could be an advantage if it were improved in certain ways (#17). The consensus among respondents was that the bilingual program at RCBS generally had beneficial effects on students during the 1978-79 school year (#18) and that it was justifiable to seek additional ESEA Title VII funding for the bilingual program at RCBS for September 1981 and subsequent years (#19).

The administrator respondents made the following recommendations for improving the bilingual program at RCBS next year:

1. Move the program from its current school location
2. Designate the Program Director as an administrator in the local school district, i.e., on a specific payline with appropriate responsibilities and priviliges
3. Have the teacher trainer work more with the new staff assigned to the program
4. Schedule specific times for staff conferences and meetings
5. Plan effectively, and in particular, overcome the "at-the-last-minute syndrome"
6. Employ a typist-receptionist in order to assure smooth office operation

SECTION IV: DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

This section discusses evaluation findings relating to student achievement (by grade and language dominant group), staff development and training, and program management, and offers interpretations of these findings, i.e., attempts to ascertain their meaning. Whereas in the previous section findings have been presented and dicussed at face value, here it is necessary to assess the quality of the data, the validity of the evaluation procedures used, the appropriateness of the performance objectives, and then finally to make an overall determination of the program's accomplishments during the 1978-79 academic year.

The following section, Conclusion and Recommendations, briefly summarizes past and current program accomplishments, comments on program promise, and offers recommendations for strengthening the program in the future.

Student Achievement

Generally, student achievement during the 1978-79 academic year as analyzed by the Bond and Singer procedures in the previous section appears less positive than in the three previous years, when the Bond and Singer procedures were also employed in the evaluation of the program. However, there appears to be reason to question the application of this analytic procedure to the data in some instances.

Of the 12 Bond and Singer analyses made in this study, four provided results which indicated that students made statistically significant improvements in academic growth rates, four indicated that such improvements were not made, and four analyses

could not be carried out because of incomplete data or lack of data. However in the 8 instances where alternate pretest-post-test analyses could be applied, students made statistically significant improvements in mean scores in all instances; moreover, students demonstrated absolute mean score gains of considerable magnitude, e.g., from a low of .9 grade equivalents (G.E.'s) to a high of 2.2 G.E.'s during the academic year. With only one exception, in these 8 instances, these mean score gains translated into above normal growth rates, i.e., above a gain of .1 G.E.'s per month in school.

Three of the four instances in which no significant improvements in growth rates were demonstrated by the Bond and Singer method were in English reading by English-dominant and Spanish-dominant students. In the previous three years the students at RCBS generally demonstrated quite satisfactory achievement in English reading, in terms of growth rate and frequently in terms of end-of-year reading level. The evaluators note that for the first time a specially developed set of NYC forms of the California Achievement Test (CAT) reading battery were used this year. In prior years evaluations had employed the MAT and the CAT reading batteries. NYC forms of the CAT reading battery were administered at the beginning of the school year and then again in late March 1979; however, the latter testing was declared invalid by the Office of Educational Evaluation of the NYC Board of Education and a regular form of the CAT was administered a second time late in the school year. Thus, the reading data for this evaluation comes from the pretesting with a special NYC form of the CAT and a second administration using a regular form of the CAT.

These circumstances, in addition to what was earlier noted about the absolute gains in mean reading scores, suggest that some forms of the CAT reading battery given students at RCBS this year can be question; the evaluators particularly mistrust the validity of the intervals within the CAT grade equivalent norms. These intervals are of crucial importance in applying the Bond and Singer procedure; if they are not meaningful the results can be nonsense. This would appear to be the case in this instance; and this conclusion would seem to explain the contradictory results obtained by the Bond and Singer analyses and the absolute gains of posttest over pretest results in English reading.

Because legitimate questions can be raised about the Bond and Singer analyses of the CAT reading data, the evaluators judge these analyses as not appropriate for the English reading objectives of this evaluation and choose to rely on the alternate pretest-posttest analyses for assessing achievement of English reading objectives.

Seventh Grade English-Dominant

This group demonstrated achievement of two of its four objectives: English as a dominant language reading (Objective 1) and student attitude toward achievement -- or achievement motivation -- (Objective 4). The group made a significant improvement in Spanish as a second language reading (Objective 3) during the year but did not demonstrate a statistically significant increase in reading growth rate, as anticipated by the objective. No data was available for analysis of math in the dominant language (Objective 2).

The group made a mean gain of 1.1 G.E.'s in English reading,

from 6.6 G.E.'s at pretesting to 7.7 G.E.'s at posttesting, on the CAT reading battery. At the end of the year the group was reading at a level that was only .2 G.E.'s below national norms. In Spanish as a second language reading, the group gained 1.0 G.E.'s -- i.e., a full year's growth -- from 5.7 G.E.'s to 6.7 G.E. on the IAS Prueba de Lectura; however, as indicated previously this improvement was not found to represent a significant increase in reading growth rate. At the end of the year the group was reading at a level estimated to be 1.2 G.E.'s below norms for Spanish-speaking children in Puerto Rico. Although they did not meet the objective as stated, in all other respects the group's achievement in Spanish reading would appear to be quite satisfactory, in the evaluator's opinion. At the end of the year the group's mean score on the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students was at the 47%ile of the norms for English-dominant students, adequately meeting the criteria of the objective for achievement motivation.

Seventh Grade Spanish-Dominant

This group achieved its objectives for Spanish as a dominant language reading (Objective 5), English as a second language reading (Objective 8) and achievement motivation (Objective 10). Achievement of dominant language math (Objective 6) could not be determined because of a lack of data, and math achievement in English (Objective 9) could not be assessed in accordance with the objective because data was incomplete.

The group made a significant improvement in growth rate in Spanish reading, advancing 1.1 G.E.'s from 4.2 G.E.'s to 5.3 G.E.'s during the year on the IAS Prueba de Lectura.

Separate analyses of "Spanish-dominant" and "Mixed Dominance" subgroups of Spanish-speaking students indicated that the former subgroup did not make a significant improvement in Spanish reading growth rate, but that the latter subgroup did. However, the "Spanish-dominant" subgroup was reading nearly on grade level, while the "Mixed dominance" subgroup was 3.4 G.E.'s below norm.

The group made a signiffcant improvement in English as a second language reading on the CAT reading battery, gaining .9 G.E.'s, from 4.5 G.E.'s to 5.4 G.E.'s. At the end of the year the group was 2.5 G.E.'s below national norms for English-speaking students. Also, both "Spanish-dominant" and "Mixed dominance" subgroups made significant improvements in English as a second language reading.

For math in English achievement only posttest scores were available for the "Mixed dominance" subgroup (instructional groups 3, 4 and 5). These students obtained a posttest mean score of 5.0 G.E.'s on the CAT Math test, which was 2.8 G.E.'s below the national norms for English-speaking students. Though quite low in terms of norms for English-speaking students, this score appears to represent a satisfactory level of performance for this group. Last year's seventh grade (including instruction group 2 of the "Spanish-dominant" subgroup -- but a different group of students) obtained an end-of-year mean score of only 4.8 G.E.'s on this instrument.

At the end of the year Spanish-dominant seventh graders demonstrated a high level of achievement motivation, scoring at the 56%ile for Spanish-dominant students. Moreover, the "Spanish-dominant" subgroup scored at the 75%ile on its norm

and the "Mixed dominance" subgroup scored at the 58%ile of its own appropriate norm.

Eighth Grade English-Dominant

This group achieved its objectives for English as a dominant language reading (Objective 11), Spanish as a second language reading (Objective 13) and student achievement motivation (Objective 14). No data was available for math in English (Objective 12).

The group made a significant improvement in mean scores on the CAT reading battery and gained 1.5 G.E.'s during the year, from 7.4 G.E.'s to 8.9 G.E.'s. At the end of the year the group was reading on grade level in terms of national norms for English-speaking students.

The group achieved a significant increase in rate of reading growth in Spanish, gaining 2.2 G.E.'s from 4.6 G.E.'s to 6.7 G.E.'s. However, the group's end-of-year mean score was 2.2. G.E.'s below norms for Spanish-speaking students in Puerto Rico.

The group made an end-of-year mean score on the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students which was at the 55%ile of norms for English-dominant students.

Eighth Grade Spanish-Dominant

This group clearly achieved four out of five of its objectives: Spanish as a dominant language reading (Objective 15), Spanish as a dominant language math (Objective 16), English as a second language reading (Objective 18) and student achievement motivation (Objective 20). Achievement for math in English (Objective 19) could not be fully determined because the data were incomplete.

The group demonstrated a significant increase in Spanish reading growth rate during the year; however, the group performed at a fairly low level in terms of norms for Spanish-speaking students, advancing from 5.0 G.E.'s to 5.9 G.E.'s, or gaining .9 G.E.'s. The group was 3.0 G.E.'s below Puerto Rican norms at the end of the year. In terms of the two subgroups, the "Spanish-dominant" subgroup demonstrated a significant increase in reading growth rate, but the "Mixed dominance" group did not (i.e., the reverse of the 7th graders).

The group made a significant increase in math in Spanish as measured by the Prueba de Aprovechamiento en Matemáticas.

The group made a significant increase in English reading growth rate on the CAT reading battery (the only grade group to do so) and also a significant pretest-posttest improvement in mean score, gaining 1.2 G.E.'s, from 5.2 G.E.'s to 6.4. G.E.'s. The group's end-of-year score was 2.5 G.E.'s below national norms for English-speaking students.

End-of-the-year English math scores for the "Mixed dominance" subgroup (instructional groups 3, 4 and 5) were at a mean of 5.2 G.E.'s on the CAT math test. Last year's eighth graders -- i.e., a different eighth grade -- (including instruction group 2) made a mean of 5.6 G.E.'s. While seventh graders this group obtained a posttest mean score of 4.8 G.E.'s on this test. The evaluators are not sure what this means; some improvement was obviously made; how much cannot be determined without the scores of instruction group 2.

The group made an end-of-year mean score on the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students which was at the 48%ile for

"Spanish-dominant" and "Mixed dominance" students combined. The "Spanish-dominant" subgroup scored at the 86%ile of its applicable norms, while the "Mixed dominance" subgroup scored at the 44%ile of its applicable norms.

Staff Development and Training

The program achieved its objective for staff development and training (Objective 22). The great majority of the instructional staff who participated in the program's pre-service training, in-service training, special workshops and in university coursework funded by the program evaluated all of these staff development and training activities in a positive manner. Their evaluations indicated that these activities were useful in preparing instructional staff to carry out their assigned duties in the program.

The evaluators note, however, that approximately half of the instructional staff participated in any one of the four training activities.

Program Management

The evaluators found that the management or organizational structure of the RCBS was well-suited to implementing a bilingual education program. This was the case with respect to the interal organization of the program at the RCBS as well as to the larger, District structure within which it was situated. The evaluators found some evidence that management processes (e.g., definition of staff duties and roles) had improved during the year. However, most of the information bearing on the management processes of the RCBS, which was obtained from both administrative and instructional staff by means of end-of-year questionnaires, was negative.

The evaluators believe that the effectiveness of the program's management processes was not generally improved during the 1978-79 academic year (Objective 23). However the evaluators also believe that the program's management processes were not seriously impaired this year, as some of the staff criticism would seem to suggest. The program did appear to have at the end of the year a somewhat serious problem of staff morale and job satisfaction.

Overall Program Accomplishment

The evaluators employed 18 objectives to assess student achievement at the RCBS during the 1978-79 academic year. In the evaluators' opinion the program clearly accomplished 13 of these 18 objectives: students demonstrated academic achievement by making significant increases in academic growth rates (Spanish reading), significant pretest-posttest improvements in mean scores (English reading and math in Spanish) or achieved end-of-year percentile criteria (achievement motivation).

The seventh grade English-dominant students achieved their objectives for English reading, Spanish reading and achievement motivation. The seventh grade Spanish-dominant students achieved their objectives for Spanish reading, English reading and achievement motivation. The eighth grade English dominant students achieved their objectives for English-reading, Spanish reading and achievement motivation. The eighth grade Spanish-dominant students achieved their objectives for Spanish reading, math in Spanish, English reading and achievement motivation.

In fact, the only objectives not demonstrably achieved were those for which data was lacking (seventh and eighth grade

English as a dominant language math, and seventh grade Spanish-dominant math) or incomplete (seventh and eighth grade English as a second language math). In the latter case the evaluators were able to infer from available data that a satisfactory degree of student achievement may have occured.

Overall, the evaluators found that the achievement of students in the program at RCBS was quite satisfactory. In fact, the academic performance of the eighth grade English-dominant students (who are mainly Hispanic) suggests they would probably do well in, or at least could cope with, instruction in all-English-speaking classes as well as do well or cope with instruction in all-Spanish-speaking classes, should their families return to Puerto Rico or to other Spanish-speaking areas. The same would probably be true of the eighth grade "Spanish-dominant" subgroup of Spanish-speaking students but probably not for the "Mixed dominance" subgroup. Although the latter subgroup made significant academic improvements, their level of academic functioning in both Spanish and English remains low.

With regard to staff development and training activities, the evaluators determined that these activities were viewed positively by participating staff and were likely to assist the staff in carrying out their duties in the program. Only half of the staff appeared, however, to be taking advantage of various training activities.

The evaluators found that the program's management processes did not appear to improve during the academic year, as was anticipated in Objective 23. However, neither were program management processes seriously impaired during the year. At

worse the program staff appears to be experiencing a low level of morale and job satisfaction, which the evaluators believe could be remedied by an appropriate training intervention.

SECTION V: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluations of the bilingual education program at the RCBS during the past three years found a high level of program attainment, particularly with respect to student achievement. The evaluation findings for this fourth year, 1978-79, clearly follows the pattern of previous years. The program at RCBS has been, and currently is, successful in educating bilingual adolescents at the junior high level -- a difficult phase of human development.

However, given the quality of students, staff, RCBS facilities and management capability of the administrative staff, the evaluators believe that the program is stuck on a plateau of successful accomplishment -- admittedly a high one -- but is capable of doing even better in the future. The evaluators believe that the program should aim in the future for even higher levels of accomplishment. They believe that there is evidence that this will be possible in the future, particularly if training activities can be reinvigorated and the effectiveness of program management processes can be improved, including staff morale and job satisfaction.

The evaluators strongly recommend that this effective, proven model bilingual edcuation program be refunded under ESEA Title VII or other appropriate funding sources. What seems most important here is that an exemplary <u>junior high school</u> model of bilingual edcuation <u>be</u> continuted with adequate external support.

In order to enhance and strengthen the program during its subsequent years of operation, the evaluators offer the program and the district staff the following recommendations and suggestions:

Recommendations:

1. Have the administrative staff undertake a major effort to assess the educational and other needs of the so-called "Mixed dominance" or "Aspira" students, to carefully plan instructional program based on their identified needs, and then to implement and evaluate these programs. It is unlikely that the program can achieveits next, higher plateau of achievement without discovering effective means of educating this subgroup within the program.

2. Include in the evaluation design for next year a significant educational and management process (formative) component. This addition to the evaluation design could provide significant feedback on students' learning in the classrooms as well as on management processess affecting the program as a whole.

3. Provide management training for both administrators and non-administrators working at the RCBS. Such training should, among other things, give non-administrators, insight into, and understanding of, management which will diminish negative criticism.

4. In order to provide additional, useful diagnostic information on students and their achievement motivation, administer the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students at the beginning of the school year. The scale can be easily scored and the percentile norms developed for it can provide for interpretation of scores. (Eventually the RCBS should develop pretest norms for the Scale and perhaps other forms of the Scale).

5. Eliminate the objective for math achievement in Spanish, since apparently no replacement can be found for the Prueba de Aprovechamiento en Matemáticas.

6. Assess the need for staff development and training, then plan, implement and evaluate new staff development and training activities, since the current activities are being utilized by relatively few program staff.

7. Provide regular staff meetings which have a definite agenda, structure and procedural rules.

8. Assigned the teacher trainer to those new staff members who are in most need of the assistance of a trainer.

9. Program administrators should become aware of, and take care to avoid, any policies or practices which might be interpreted by staff as "preferential treatment" of themselves or any other staff members.

APPENDICES

A. Questionnaire for School and District Administrators

B. Questionnaire for Bilingual Program Staff

C. Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students (English Version)

D. Percentile Norms for Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students (Achievement Motivation)

E. Procedures for Scoring Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students

F. Procedures Employed in the Bond and Singer Method

APPENDIX A

EDWARD J. CERVENKA, PH.D.
CONSULTANT IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS
617 WEST END AVENUE
SUITE 9-A
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10024
(212) 724-0160

June 15, 1979

Dear Administrator:

This questionnaire is part of the 1978-79 evaluation of your ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program. As a member of the District's and/or school's administrative staff, you can provide an important and different perspective on the Program, than that provided by the Program staff. Your responses to this questionnaire are needed so that your viewpoints can be incorporated in the evaluation.

Please answer all of the questions frankly. You are asked not to put your name on your questionnaire. Generally, your responses can be given by marking a check (✓) or a number in the appropriate blanks. Some questions will have more than one answer or require you to mark in several places. For those areas in which you might have insufficient information to make a judgment, an appropriate category of response has been provided. At the end of the questionnaire you are asked to make recommendations for improving the Program. Also, additional space is given for any other comments.

A self-addressed envelope is provided in which to seal your completed questionnaire and return it either via the Bilingual Program Director or directly to the evaluators.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Cervenka

Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D.
Title VII Program Evaluator

Questionnaire for School and District Administrators

Code : f = frequency or number responding; % = percent responding; m = mean rating
4 = total number of questionnaire respondents

1. What is your position in the school system?

f	%	School Positions	f	%	District Positions
0	0	Principal	0	0	District Administrator
0	0	Assistant Principal	0	0	Other_____
1	25	Coordinator			
0	0	Supervisor			
3	75	Other Director Title VII, Teacher Trainer			

2. At what level of school administration are you involved?

4	100	An individual school
0	0	Two or more schools
0	0	District level only

3. Would you characterize yourself as being directly or indirectly involved with the Title VII Bilingual Program in the school?

4	100	Directly involved
0	0	Indirectly involved
0	0	Involvement difficult to characterize in the above terms

4. For how many years, including this one, has your school and/or District been providing a program of bilingual instruction?

0	0	One year	0	0	Five years
0	0	Two years	4	100	Six years or more
0	0	Three years			
0	0	Four years			

5. To the best of your knowledge, what percentage of students needing ESL or bilingual instruction in your school(s) or District are being served by the A) Title VII Bilingual Program and by B) other school or District programs?

Title VII Bilingual Program			Other School or District Programs	
f	%		f	%
2	50	90-100%	0	0
0	0	80-89%	0	0
0	0	70-79%	1	25
0	0	60-69%	0	0
2	50	50-59%	0	0
0	0	40-49%	0	0
0	0	30-39%	0	0
0	0	20-29	0	0
0	0	0-19	0	0
0	0	Do Not Know	3	75

... could you characterize the benefits that students derived from participating in the Bilingual Program (including its ESL instruction)?

f	%		f	%	
3	75	Essential	0	0	Minor
1	25	Important	0	0	Inconsequential
0	0	Helpful	0	0	Do not know

Comments: _____

_____

_____

7. In your opinion, how much time should students spend in Bilingual Program classes, activities, etc. (as opposed to time in JHS 45 classes, activities, etc.)?

1	25	Much more time	0	0	Somewhat less time
1	25	Somewhat more time	0	0	Much less time
2	75	About the same as now	0	0	Do not know or not applicable

8. Below is a list of possible problem areas you may have encountered in the operation of the Bilingual Program in your school or District. Indicate how serious each has been by using the following scale:

	Numerical Equivalents
A = No problem	A = 1
B = Slight problem	B = 2
C = Moderately serious problem	C = 3
D = Very serious problem	D = 4
NA = Not applicable	

f	m	
4	1.8	Selection of participating students
2	2	Mainstreaming of participating students
4	2.3	Placement and grouping of students for instruction (including class size, heterogeneousness in terms of learning ability, etc.)
4	4	Adequacy of instructional space
4	2.5	Testing of participating students
4	2	Scheduling of instruction (including length of periods)
4	2.3	Communication between Program teachers and other teachers in the school
4	3	Cooperation between Program teachers and other teachers in the school
4	1.8	Student attendance
3	2.7	Integration of Bilingual Program and non-Bilingual Program students for non-academic classes or secondary curricular areas
4	2.5	Attendance of Program teachers
4	1	Attendance of paraprofessionals, aides and other auxiliary instructional staff
4	2.5	Instructional competence of Bilingual Program teachers
4	2.3	Instructional competence of paraprofessionals, aides and other auxiliary instructional staff
4	1.5	Quantity of materials and other instructional aids available
4	2	Quality or appropriateness of materials or other instructional aids available
4	1.8	Parent and community involvement and support of the Bilingual Program
4	1.3	Assistance and cooperation of Program Director
4	1.3	Assistance and cooperation of Other administrative staff of the Program

9. ave provisions been made for regular meetings and/or workshops between Program teachers and other teachers in the school for purposes of exchanging information, feedback on students, instructional materials and techniques, etc.?

f	%	
1	25	Yes, regular and frequent meetings are provided for
0	0	Yes, but more contact between these two groups is needed
1	25	No, only occasional meetings are provided for
1	25	No, no meetings are provided for
1	25	Not applicable to my school or situation

10. During the past year, how frequently have you performed or been involved with the following activities relating to the Bilingual Program? Use following scale:

	Numerical Equivalents
A = Nine or more times	A = 1
B = Six to eight times	B = 2
C = Three to five times	C = 3
D = Once or twice	D = 4
E = Never	E = 5
F = Not applicable	

f	m	
4	1	Participated in the implementation in the school of Bilingual Program policy, regulations and/or program modifications
4	1.8	Participated in the evaluation and needs assessment of the Program vis-a-vis established Program guidelines (i.e., those established by the Program proposal, Program Director, District Office, etc.)
4	1.8	Participated in the evaluation and needs assessment of the Program vis-a-vis actual classrooms and parent-community realities
4	2.2	Participated in the development or review of Program Proposal for Continuation or Grant Application
4	1.3	Conferred and/or met with parents of students in the Bilingual Program
3	1	Called upon the Program Director to deal with problems relating to instruction, staff and student matters, etc.
3	1	Called upon other Program administrative staff to deal with problems relating to instruction, staff and student matters, etc.
4	1.8	Reviewed the curricular content of the Bilingual Program in the school
4	2.2	Reviewed the management of the Program in the school
3	1	Participated in the development of selection criteria and process for admission of new students in the Program
2	3	Reviewed Program student enrollment and achievement for the purpose of transferring students <u>out</u> of the Program and into the "mainstream"
4	1.5	Observed Program teachers and/or paraprofessionals giving instruction
3	1	Conferred with the Program Director concerning the Program
4	2.5	Conferred with PAC representative(s) in regard to matters pertaining to the Program

11. To what extent has the Bilingual Program increased parental involvement in school affairs this school year?

f	%		f	%	
3	75	Substantially	0	0	Not at all
0	0	Moderately	1	25	Do not know
0	0	Slightly			

12. To what extent are parents of students in the Bilingual Program aware of the special goals, rationale and benefits of the Program?

f	%	
0	0	Clearly aware
3	75	Have some awareness
0	0	Are unaware of any distinction between this specific program and regular school curriculum and activities
1	25	Do not know

Comments: _____

_____

_____

13. Indicate how effective you believe Program management has been with respect to the management functions listed below. Use the following scale:

	Numerical Equivalents
A = Very effective	A = 1
B = Effective	B = 2
C = Not effective	C = 3
D = Detremental	D = 4
X = Do not know/not applicable	

f	m		f	m	
4	2.5	Leadership/management style	4	2.2	Internal evaluation and monitoring
4	2	Program planning	4	2	Procurement of materials and supplies
4	2.5	Decision making/policy formulation	4	2.2	Operation and efficiency of Program office
4	2	Delegation of authority	4	1.5	Dissemination of information about Program
4	2	Selection of staff	4	1.8	Formulation and modification of Program goals and objectives
4	2.5	Supervision and evaluation of personnel	3	2.3	Development and/or use of grievance procedures
4	2.8	Feedback to subordinates and superiors	3	2.7	Management of instruction (i.e., all those factors affecting instruction except teaching)
4	2.2	Communication	3	2.7	Space and time utilization and management
4	2.2	Organization and coordination of activities			

Comments: _____

_____

_____

14. How often did you communicate or confer, either formally or informally, with the Program staff about the Program?

f	%		f	%	
3	75	Very frequently	0	0	Very infrequently
1	25	Frequently	0	0	Never
0	0	Infrequently			

15. Generally how useful and informative were these communications or conferences?

1	25	Very useful and informative	0	0	Neither useful nor informative
3	75	Moderately useful and informative	0	0	Not applicable/no conferences or communications
0	0	Slightly useful and informative			

16. As you may be aware, the teachers and paraprofessionals in the Bilingual Program are responsible and obligated to two separate, and possibly conflicting, lines of authority; these are (A) the school administration and (B) the Bilingual Program administration. Acknowledging this possible blurring of supervisory lines, have you developed a policy for the areas of Bilingual Program activity for which you have supervisory or administrative responsibility, and for other areas which fall under the domain of the Bilingual Program Director and other Bilingual Program administrative staff? (You may choose several answers)

f	%	
0	0	There is established written policy which delineates my areas of responsibility
3	75	No written policy, but I have a clear understanding of my areas of responsibility
1	25	No written policy; I determine my responsibility on an individual case basis
2	50	I expect teachers and/or Bilingual Program staff to come to me first, and then I can make a determination of responsibility
0	0	I leave determination of responsibility to the discretion of the teachers and/or school administration
1	25	The Program staff and I have met and jointly determined our separate areas of responsibility.
0	0	The Program teachers and I have met and jointly determined my areas of responsibility
0	0	No determination — this issue has never required my attention
0	0	No opinion/not applicable

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

17. Which statement best sums up your opinion of the Program?

2	50	It is a vital addition to our school system.
1	25	It is definitely an advantage to our school system.
1	25	It could be an advantage if it were improved in certain ways.
0	0	It is rather ineffectual in terms of our initial expectations.
0	0	It is more of a hinderance than an asset.

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

18. If this year (1978-79) there had been no Bilingual Program funded under Title VII, what probably would have been the case in terms of the items listed below? (Use the following scale:

	Numerical Equivalents
A = Much greater	A = 1
B = Somewhat greater	B = 2
C = Same/not affected	C = 3
D = Somewhat less	D = 4
E = Much less	E = 5

f	m	
4	4.5	Amount of work for you
4	4	Students' academic achievement

(Continued on following page)

(Item No. 18 cont.)

f	m	
4	4.3	Students' psychological and social development (confidence, self esteem, motivation, peer relationships, school adjustment, etc.)
4	4.8	Students' knowledge of and pride in cultural heritage
4	4.3	Student attendance
4	4.8	Provision of individualized instruction
4	4.8	Training and staff development
4	4.5	Assistance with testing students/measuring their progress and achievement
4	4.5	Assistance with curriculum
4	4.8	Instructional materials, aids and supplies
4	4.3	Assistance with parent-school matters
4	4.3	Parent involvement in school activities

Other (Please specify: _____)

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

19. In your opinion, is it justifiable to seek additional ESEA Title VII funding for the Bilingual Program at RCBS (whose present grant terminates year after next, school year 1980-81) for September 1981 and subsequent years?

f	%		f	%		f	%	
4	100	Yes	0	0	No	0	0	No opinion

Also, please comment on how you think the Bilingual Program can be institutionalized in the school and District after Title VII funding expires.

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. Please list below any suggestions you may have to offer for improving the Program next year and in subsequent years. (Use back of page if necessary.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

EDWARD J. CERVENKA, PH.D.
CONSULTANT IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS
617 WEST END AVENUE
SUITE 9-A
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10024
(212) 724-0160

June 15, 1979

Dear Staff Member:

This questionnaire is part of the 1978-79 evaluation of your ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program. As a staff member, you have an important and immediate perspective on the Program. Your responses to this questionnaire are needed so that your viewpoints can be taken into account by the evaluation. Please answer all questions frankly. You are asked not to put your name on your questionnaire. Generally, your responses can be given by marking a check (✓) or a number in the appropriate blanks. Some questions will have more than one answer, or require you to mark in several places. At the end of the questionnaire you are asked to make recommendations for improving the Program. Also, additional space is given for any other comments.

A self-addressed envelope is provided in which to seal your completed questionnaire and return it either via the Bilingual Program Director or directly to the evaluators.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Cervenka, Ph.D.
Title VII Program Evaluator

RAFAEL CORDEPO BILINGUAL SCHOOL: NYC DISTRICT 4 TITLE VII BILINGUAL PROGRAM

Questionnaire for Bilingual Program Staff

Code: f = frequency or number responding; % = percent responding; m = mean rating
12 = total number of questionnaire respondents

1. What is your position in the Bilingual Program?

f	%	
9	75	Teacher
1	8	Auxilary Personnel (Paraprofessional, Educational Assistant, Teacher Aide, etc.)
2	17	Technical, Specialist or Resource Personnel (Media Coordinator, Guidance Counselor, Curriculum Materials Specialist, etc.)
0	0	Administrative staff
0	0	Other (Please specify:_____)

2. Besides teaching, assisting with teaching, or administration, what are your main duties and responsibilities in the Program?

5	42	No other main duties in the Program
1	8	Curriculum and materials development
0	0	Staff training
0	0	Supervision
3	25	Participating in regular staff meetings
5	42	Conferring with parents
2	17	Parent and adult community involvement activities
2	17	Counseling and guidance
2	17	Selection and placement of students
2	17	Testing and evaluating students
2	17	Planning of Program activities with Non-Program staff
2	17	Coordination of Program activities with Non-Program staff
0	0	Non-Program duties and activities (e.g. substituting in non-program classes)
0	0	Other(Please specify:_____)

3. How long have you been in your current position?

3	15	One year or less
5	42	Two years
2	17	Three to five years
2	17	Six years or more

4. How many years have you been in bilingual education or a related field?

0	0	One year or less
3	25	Two years
4	33	Three to five years
5	42	Six or more years

5. How much formal university training have you had in bilingual education?

f	%	
0	0	None
2	17	1-2 courses (3-6 credit hours)
2	17	3-5 courses (9-15 credit hours)
3	25	6-10 courses (18-30 credit hours)
1	8	B.A. degree in bilingual education
2	17	M.A. degree in bilingual education
2	17	Beyond M.A. degree in bilingual education

6. In your opinion, how helpful was the pre-service(summer) training provided by the Program this year?

1	8	Very helpful
2	17	Helpful
0	0	Unhelpful
0	0	Very unhelpful
9	75	Not applicable/did not participate

Comments _____

_____

7. In your opinion, how helpful was overall in-service training provided by the Program this year?

2	17	Very helpful
3	25	Helpful
0	0	Unhelpful
0	0	Very unhelpful
7	58	Not applicable/did not participate

Comments _____

_____

8. In your opinion, how helpful were the special workshops (one day or short term) provided by the Program this year?

2	17	Very helpful
3	25	Helpful
1	8	Unhelpful
0	0	Very unhelpful
6	50	Not applicable/did not participate

Comments _____

_____

_____

9. In your opinion, how helpful were the university courses provided under ESEA Title VII that you took this year?

f	%	
3	25	Very helpful
3	25	Helpful
0	0	Unhelpful
0	0	Very unhelpful
6	50	Not applicable/did not participate

Comments _____

List of courses enrolled in for 1978-79 Contrastive Analysis of Eng and Span. Advanced Psychology, Spanish Practicum, Problems in Metropolitan Areas, Theory and Practice of Bilingual Education, Research course.

10. Using the scale provided (below and to the right), indicate in which subject areas of instruction you feel a need for additional professional preparation for bilingual education.

f	m	
10	3	English as a Second Language
10	2.6	Spanish as a Second Language
9	3.2	English Language Arts
9	2.7	Spanish Language Arts
8	3	Social Studies
9	2.4	Math
8	3	Science
7	3.7	Career Awareness Instruction/Vocational Training for Bilingual Students
8	3.3	Bilingual Education of Students through the Arts (including use of media)
7	3	Guidance for Bilingual Students
7	3.1	Improvement of Students' Self-concept through Bilingual Education
7	3	Promotion of Biculturalism through Bilingual Education
7	2.7	Teaching a Second Culture and Cultural Heritage
7	3	Teaching U.S.Culture and Cultural Heritage

Scale
5= Very Great
4= Substantial
3= Moderate
2= Slight
1= No need

11. Using the scales provided below indicate your feelings regarding current Program efficacy and Program Administrative Staff need for training or improvement for each of the management processes listed below:

Scale A: Current Program Efficacy	Scale B: Need for Training/Improvement
5= Very effective	5= Very great
4= Effective	4= Substantial
3= Ineffective	3= Moderate
2= Very ineffective	2= Slight
1= Insufficient information	1= Insufficient information
NA= Not applicable	NA= Not applicable

#11. continued

Current Efficacy f	Current Efficacy m	Processes/Activities	Need for Training/ Improvement f	Need for Training/ Improvement m
12	3.6	Planning and development (proposals, curricula, lessons)	12	3.4
12	3.6	Formulation and modification of goals and objectives	11	3.5
12	2.5	Leadership/Management Style	11	3.3
11	2.4	Decision making/Policy formulation	11	3.8
11	2.4	Delegation of authority	11	4.3
10	3.4	Budgeting (cost/work analysis and projection)	10	3.2
10	3.1	Coordination and organization	10	3.6
11	3.2	Communication with other Program staff	11	3.5
10	2.4	Communication non-Program staff	10	3.4
10	3.4	Scheduling of Program and classroom activities and events	10	3.3
11	3.1	Supervision and evaluation of personnel	11	3.5
11	2.6	Group problem-solving	11	4.1
11	2.9	Internal evaluation (including giving and receiving feedback)	11	3.8
11	2.9	Program grievance and "input" procedures	10	4
11	3.1	Training of personnel	11	3.5
11	3	Management of instruction (i.e. all factors affecting instruction other than teaching)	11	3
11	3.6	Language use policies	11	3.1
11	3.4	Supportive services	10	3.3
11	3.6	Procurement and management of supplies, materials and -equipment	11	2.7
11	3	Space and time utilization and management	11	2.9
11	3.4	Office operation and efficiency	10	3.2

12. How are Program directives and news communicated and circulated among the staff? (You may mark more than one answer.)

f	%	
		Oral
0	0	Telephone conversations
12	100	Staff meetings
5	42	One-to-one conferences
4	33	Word of mouth/grapevine
0	00	Other(Please specify: _____)
		Written
6	50	Letters
12	100	Memos
1	8	Program proposal/Program modifications
0	0	Other: (Please specify _____)

13. How often did you confer or communicate, either formally or informally, with the A) Program Director and B) other administrative staff about the Program? (Put a check in each column)

f	%	A) Program Director	f	%	B) Other Administrative Staff
4	33		3	25	Very Frequently
2	17		4	33	Frequently
4	33		5	42	Infrequently
2	17		0	0	Very infrequently or never

14. Generally how useful and informative have staff conferences or meetings been in the Program this year?

2	17	Very useful and informative
4	33	Moderately useful and informative
3	25	Slightly useful and informative
3	25	Neither useful nor informative
0	0	Not applicable/No conferences or staff meetings held

15. In your opinion, Program need assessments, internal evaluations, modifications and other changes are initiated at which level? (Check one or more levels and indicate approximate percentage of changes at each level)

		Level	Mean	Percentage
8	67	Teachers	40	____%
4	33	Paraprofessionals and aides	13	____%
7	58	Technical, Specialist and Resource Staff	12	____%
9	75	Bilingual Program administrators	39	____%
6	50	School administrators	19	____%
5	42	District administrators	25	____%
0	0	Other (Please specify: _____)	0	____%
				100%

16. In your opinion, how might Program selection and/or grouping procedures be improved? (Check as many answers as applicable)

0	0	Do not know
0	0	All right as they are
6	50	More effective or appropriate tests
9	75	More effective or appropriate assessment procedures
4	33	Changes in school or District policies and procedures
7	58	More input from Program teachers
4	33	More observation of students in classrooms
1	8	More parental input
0	0	Other (Specify: _____)

_____

Comments: _____

_____

To what extent did you participate in the process of selecting and grouping students for the program? (Check one)

f	%	
3	25	Not at all
3	25	To a slight extent
5	42	To some extent
1	8	To a substantial extent
0	0	Totally or almost totally responsible

18. To what extent were you satisfied with the procedures for selecting and grouping students for the program? (Check your appropriate grade level)

7th Grade 7			8th Grade 8	
f	%		f	%
0	0	Very satisfied	0	0
6	50	Satisfied	6	50
4	33	A little unsatisfied	5	42
1	8	Very unsatisfied	0	0
1	8	Not applicable	1	8

19. To what extent did you participate in the "mainstreaming" of students from the Program? (Check one)

9	75	Not at all
1	9	To a slight extent
0	0	To some extent
0	0	To a substantial extent
0	0	Totally or almost totally responsible
2	17	Not applicable

20. To what extent were you satisfied with the criteria and procedures for mainstreaming students from the Program? (Check your appropriate grade level)

7th Grade 7			8th Grade 8	
7	58	Not applicable	7	58
1	8	Very satisfied	1	8
2	17	Satisfied	2	17
2	17	A little unsatisfied	2	17
0	0	Very unsatisfied	0	0

21. In your opinion, how might exit or mainstreaming criteria and procedures be improved? (Check as many answers as applicable)

5	42	Do not know
1	8	All right as they are
2	17	More effective or appropriate tests
4	33	More effective or appropriate assessment procedures
0	0	Raising (i.e., making more rigorous) exit criteria
0	0	Lowering (i.e., making less rigorous) exit criteria
3	25	More input from Program teachers
1	8	More observation of students in bilingual classrooms
0	0	More parental input
0	0	Other (Specify: _____)
2	17	Not applicable

Comments: _____

...ther instructional aids available to you during the year?

f	%	Quantity	Quality	f	%
3	25		More than adequate/Very appropriate		
4	33		Adequate/Appropriate	4	33
4	33		Inadequate/Inappropriate	4	33
1	8		Very inadequate/Very inappropriate	1	8

Comments: _____

_____

_____

23. Were you provided with enough information regarding your teaching assignment, numbers of students, size of groups, diagnosed student needs, levels of academic functioning, language ability, etc. to order sufficient and appropriate materials for the 1978-79 school year?

1	8	More than enough information
3	25	Adequate information
4	33	Inadequate information
3	25	Very little information
1	8	No information
0	0	Not applicable/Do not order materials, etc.

Comments: _____

_____

24. During the year, how effective was the Program generally in involving parents and other adult members of the community in the Program as well as in the education of their children?

6	50	Very effective
3	25	Effective
3	25	Somewhat ineffective
0	0	Very ineffective

Comments: _____

_____

25. Which statement below best sums up your overall opinion of the Program as it functioned in 1978-79?

5	42	It is a vital addition to the total school system.
1	8	It is definitely an advantage to our school system.
6	50	It could be an advantage if it were improved in certain ways.
0	0	It is more of a hindrance than as asset.

Comments: _____

_____

26. Would you like to see the Bilingual Program continued next year and in subsequent years?

11	92	Yes, definitely	f 1	% 8	Yes	f 0	% 0	Possibly, if it can be improved	f 0	% 0	Not Sure	f 0	% 0	No

Comments: _____

27. Please use the space provided below, and on the back of this page if necessary, to give your recommendations for improving the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program next year (as well as possibly subsequent years) and also any additional information or opinions about strengths, weaknesses, problems, or accomplishments of the Program.

APPENDIX C

ATTITUDE SCALE FOR BILINGUAL STUDENTS

Instruction Booklet

READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS TO THE STUDENTS:

"This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not put your name on your answer sheet. This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to say how you feel about your school -- the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School -- and how you feel about things like studying, being a teenager and your future."

"Fill in the blanks at the top of your answer sheet with your GRADE, AGE, SEX (put F for female and M for male), CLASS (your official class), GROUP (your English-social studies group) and PRINCIPAL HOME LANGUAGE or the language used most in your home (put S for Spanish and E for English). And as I said, do not put your name on your answer sheet."

"I will read a sentence and then four possible ways to complete it. The four choices are written on your answer sheet. Listen while I read each sentence and follow on your answer sheet as I read the four answers. Mark with an X the block before the answer that best describes how you really feel. Mark only one answer. Try to mark your answer quickly without thinking too much about it. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers."

"Let's do the example. For practice let's all mark the block for 'Sort of fat.' Listen."

"I like to read books that are... A. Very fat B. Sort of fat C. Sort of thin D. Very thin."

CHECK TO SEE THAT ALL STUDENTS HAVE MARKED BLOCK B FOR "Sort of fat," AND PROCEED.

1. I go to school mainly to...
   - A. See my friends
   - B. Have a good time
   - C. Please my parents
   - D. Get a good education

2. If someone told me what my class next year would be like I would be...
   - A. Very interested
   - B. Sort of interested
   - C. Only a little interested
   - D. Not interested at all

3. I think about finishing high school...
   - A. Very often
   - B. Sometimes
   - C. Rarely
   - D. Never

4. I feel that most teachers like me...
   - A. Very much
   - B. A lot
   - C. A little
   - D. Not at all

5. I like to take trips to new places...
   - A. Very much
   - B. A lot
   - C. A little
   - D. Not at all

6. The books used in our school are...
   - A. Too difficult
   - B. Sort of difficult
   - C. Sort of easy
   - D. Too easy

7. I feel that being bilingual will help me when I grow up...
   - A. Very much
   - B. A lot
   - C. Some
   - D. It doesn't matter

8. I like to tell my family and friends about what I am learning in school...
   - A. Always
   - B. Often
   - C. Sometimes
   - D. Rarely or never

9. When I stay home from school I usually feel...
   - A. Very happy
   - B. Sort of happy
   - C. Sort of sad
   - D. Very sad

CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE

10. I like for the teacher to call on me in class...
   A. Very often
   B. Sometimes
   C. Rarely
   D. Not at all

11. If I heard my parents talking about the kind of job that I might have some day, I would be...
   A. Very interested
   B. Sort of interested
   C. Only a little interested
   D. Not interested at all

12. If my friends made fun of me for using big words, I would feel...
   A. Very embarrassed
   B. Sort of uncomfortable
   C. Sort of mad
   D. It wouldn't matter

13. I try to come to school on time...
   A. Always
   B. Most of the time
   C. Some of the time
   D. Never

14. If I discussed a newspaper story with my teacher, I would feel...
   A. Very good
   B. Sort of good
   C. Only a little good
   D. It wouldn't matter

15. I like to talk to people who have accomplished great things...
   A. Very much
   B. A lot
   C. A little
   D. Not at all

16. I like to help my friends with their schoolwork...
   A. A lot
   B. Sometimes
   C. Not much
   D. Never

17. If I could make my teacher very happy by solving a math problem I would want to...
   A. Try very hard
   B. Try sort of hard
   C. It wouldn't matter
   D. Try to get it wrong

18. When I finish high school I would like to...
   A. Take it easy
   B. Get married
   C. Get a good job
   D. Go to college

19. If I read my parents a story I had written for them, I would feel...
   A. Very proud
   B. Sort of proud
   C. A little proud
   D. It wouldn't matter

20. When it's hard to understand a new idea, I want to...
   A. Try harder
   B. Ask for help
   C. Do something else
   D. Give up

21. When I have a big assignment I want to...
   A. Finish it as soon as possible
   B. Work on it when I can
   C. Finish it at the last minute
   D. Turn it in late

22. When I watch a television program I try to think what I would do if I were the main character...
   A. Always
   B. Often
   C. Rarely
   D. Never

23. When I don't know how to spell a word, I...
   A. Use another word
   B. Guess
   C. Ask someone
   D. Look in a dictionary

24. I believe that there are some things that I'm better off <u>not</u> knowing...
   A. Strongly agree
   B. Agree
   C. Disagree
   D. Strongly disagree

25. To answer this question you must fill in the blank in the following sentence:

   When I grow up I want to be a _____

GRADE_____ AGE_____ SEX_____ CLASS_____ GROUP _____ PRINCIPAL HOME LANGUAGE_____

EXAMPLE:
- ☐ A. Very fat
- ☐ B. Sort of fat
- ☐ C. Sort of thin
- ☐ D. Very thin

1. ☐ A. See my friends
   - ☐ B. Have a good time
   - ☐ C. Please my parents
   - ☐ D. Get a good education

2. ☐ A. Very interested
   - ☐ B. Sort of interested
   - ☐ C. Only a little interested
   - ☐ D. Not interested at all

3. ☐ A. Very often
   - ☐ B. Sometimes
   - ☐ C. Rarely
   - ☐ D. Never

4. ☐ A. Very much
   - ☐ B. A lot
   - ☐ C. A little
   - ☐ D. Not at all

5. ☐ A. Very much
   - ☐ B. A lot
   - ☐ C. A little
   - ☐ D. Not at all

6. ☐ A. Too difficult
   - ☐ B. Sort of difficult
   - ☐ C. Sort of easy
   - ☐ D. Too easy

7. ☐ A. Very much
   - ☐ B. A lot
   - ☐ C. Some
   - ☐ D. It doesn't matter

8. ☐ A. Always
   - ☐ B. Often
   - ☐ C. Sometimes
   - ☐ D. Rarely or never

9. ☐ A. Very happy
   - ☐ B. Sort of happy
   - ☐ C. Sort of sad
   - ☐ D. Very sad

10. ☐ A. Very often
    - ☐ B. Sometimes
    - ☐ C. Rarely
    - ☐ D. Not at all

11. ☐ A. Very interested
    - ☐ B. Sort of interested
    - ☐ C. Only a little interested
    - ☐ D. Not interested at all

12. ☐ A. Very embarrassed
    - ☐ B. Sort of uncomfortable
    - ☐ C. Sort of mad
    - ☐ D. It wouldn't matter

13. ☐ A. Always
    - ☐ B. Most of the time
    - ☐ C. Some of the time
    - ☐ D. Never

14. ☐ A. Very good
    - ☐ B. Sort of good
    - ☐ C. Only a little good
    - ☐ D. It wouldn't matter

15. ☐ A. Very much
    - ☐ B. A lot
    - ☐ C. A little
    - ☐ D. Not at all

16. ☐ A. A lot
    - ☐ B. Sometimes
    - ☐ C. Not much
    - ☐ D. Never

17. ☐ A. Try very hard
    - ☐ B. Try sort of hard
    - ☐ C. It wouldn't matter
    - ☐ D. Try to get it wrong

18. ☐ A. Take it easy
    - ☐ B. Get married
    - ☐ C. Get a good job
    - ☐ D. Go to college

19. ☐ A. Very proud
    - ☐ B. Sort of proud
    - ☐ C. A little proud
    - ☐ D. It wouldn't matter

20. ☐ A. Try harder
    - ☐ B. Ask for help
    - ☐ C. Do something else
    - ☐ D. Give up

21. ☐ A. Finish it as soon as possible
    - ☐ B. Work on it when I can
    - ☐ C. Finish it at the last minute
    - ☐ D. Turn it in late

22. ☐ A. Always
    - ☐ B. Often
    - ☐ C. Rarely
    - ☐ D. Never

23. ☐ A. Use another word
    - ☐ B. Guess
    - ☐ C. Ask someone
    - ☐ D. Look in a dictionary

24. ☐ A. Strongly agree
    - ☐ B. Agree
    - ☐ C. Disagree
    - ☐ D. Strongly disagree

25. When I grow up I want to be

a _____

_____

APPENDIX D

PERCENTILE NORMS FOR ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION
Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students
English and Spanish Versions
Seventh and Eighth Grade Students

RAW SCORE	PERCENTILE SCORE		
	E-Norms[1]	S-Norms[2]	M-Norms[3]
71	99	--	--
70	97	--	99
69	96	--	98
68	88	96	98
67	86	96	97
66	85	95	97
65	82	94	92
64	76	92	89
63	70	90	86
62	65	86	84
61	64	80	79
60	58	75	76
59	55	60	71
58	47	56	62
57	42	48	59
56	39	35	52
55	35	33	46
54	28	25	44
53	26	21	40
52	21	15	30
51	17	8	27
50	14	8	21
49	12	7	19
48	10	6	16
47	8	4	14
46	7	2	13
45	6	2	12
44	5	2	10
43	4	1	8
42	3	1	8
41	3	0	7
40	2	--	6
39	1	--	5
38	0	--	3
37	--	--	3
36	--	--	3
35	--	--	2
34	--	--	2
...			
25	--	--	1
...			
15	--	--	0

[1] E-Norms were based on the administration of the English Version to English-dominant 7th and 8th graders, June 1977 (N = 55, M = 57.4, SD = 7.7).

[2] S-Norms were based on the administration of the Spanish Version to Spanish-dominant 7th and 8th graders, June 1977 (N = 48, M = 56.7, SD = 5.4).

[3] M-Norms were based on the administration the English or Spanish Versions to 7th and 8th graders of "mixed" dominance, the so-called "Aspira students," June 1977 (N = 100, M = 53.9, SD = 8.6).

APPENDIX E

PROCEDURES FOR SCORING ATTITUDE SCALE FOR BILINGUAL STUDENTS

GRADE_____ AGE_____ SEX_____ CLASS_____ GROUP_____ PRINCIPAL HOME LANGUAGE_____

EXAMPLE:

☐ A. Very fat
☐ B. Sort of fat
☐ C. Sort of thin
☐ D. Very thin

9.
0 A. See my friends
0 B. Have a good time
1 C. Please my parents
4 D. Get a good education

10.
3 A. Very interested
2 B. Sort of interested
1 C. Only a little interested
0 D. Not interested at all

11.
3 A. Very often
2 B. Sometimes
1 C. Rarely
0 D. Never

12.
3 A. Very much
2 B. A lot
1 C. A little
0 D. Not at all

13.
2 A. Very much
1 B. A lot
1 C. A little
0 D. Not at all

14.
1 A. Too difficult
1 B. Sort of difficult
1 C. Sort of easy
0 D. Too easy

15.
3 A. Very much
2 B. A lot
1 C. Some
0 D. It doesn't matter

16.
2 A. Always
2 B. Often
3 C. Sometimes
1 D. Rarely or never

17.
0 A. Very happy
0 B. Sort of happy
1 C. Sort of sad
2 D. Very sad

18.
3 A. Very often
2 B. Sometimes
1 C. Rarely
0 D. Not at all

19.
4 A. Very interested
2 B. Sort of interested
1 C. Only a little interested
0 D. Not interested at all

20.
1 A. Very embarrassed
1 B. Sort of uncomfortable
2 C. Sort of mad
3 D. It wouldn't matter

21.
4 A. Always
2 B. Most of the time
1 C. Some of the time
0 D. Never

22.
3 A. Very good
2 B. Sort of good
1 C. Only a little good
0 D. It wouldn't matter

23.
4 A. Very much
3 B. A lot
2 C. A little
0 D. Not at all

24.
2 A. A lot
1 B. Sometimes
0 C. Not much
0 D. Never

3 A. Try very hard
2 B. Try sort of hard
1 C. It wouldn't matter
0 D. Try to get it wrong

0 A. Take it easy
1 B. Get married
3 C. Get a good job
4 D. Go to college

3 A. Very proud
2 B. Sort of proud
1 C. A little proud
0 D. It wouldn't matter

3 A. Try harder
2 B. Ask for help
1 C. Do something else
0 D. Give up

3 A. Finish it as soon as possible
1 B. Work on it when I can
1 C. Finish it at the last minute
0 D. Turn it in late

2 A. Always
1 B. Often
0 C. Rarely
0 D. Never

1 A. Use another word
1 B. Guess
2 C. Ask someone
3 D. Look in a dictionary

1 A. Strongly agree
1 B. Agree
2 C. Disagree
3 D. Strongly disagree

25. When I grow up I want to b.

TOTAL SCORE

GRADO____ EDAD____ SEXO____ CLASE____ GRUPO____ LENGUAJE PRINCIPAL DE CASA____

EJEMPLO: 9.
- ☐ A. Bien gruesos
- ☐ B. Un poco gruesos
- ☐ C. Un poco delgados
- ☑ D. Bien delgados

1. 0 A. Ver a mis amigos — 10.
0 B. Pasar un buen rato
1 C. Complacer a mis padres
4 D. Conseguir una buena educación

2. 3 A. Muy interesado — 11.
2 B. Bastante interesado
1 C. Solamente un poco interesado
0 D. No interesado

3. 3 A. A menudo — 12.
2 B. Algunas veces
1 C. Rara vez
0 D. Nunca

4. 3 A. Muchísimo — 13.
2 B. Mucho
1 C. Un poco
0 D. De ningún modo

5. 2 A. Muchísimo — 14.
1 B. Mucho
1 C. Un poco
0 D. De ningún modo

6. 1 A. Muy difíciles — 15.
1 B. Un poco difíciles
1 C. Un poco fáciles
0 D. Demasiado fáciles

7. 3 A. Muchísimo — 16.
2 B. Mucho
1 C. Algo
0 D. No importa

8. 2 A. Siempre — 17.
2 B. Muchas veces
3 C. Algunas veces
1 D. Rara vez o nunca

0 A. Muy contento — 18.
0 B. Bastante contento
1 C. Bastante triste
2 D. Muy triste

3 A. Bien frecuentemente — 19.
2 B. Algunas veces
1 C. Rara vez
0 D. De ningún modo

4 A. Muy interesado — 20.
2 B. Bastante interesado
1 C. Solamente un poco interesado
0 D. No interesado

1 A. Bien abochornado — 21.
1 B. Un poco incómodo
2 C. Un poco de coraje
3 D. No me importaría

4 A. Siempre — 22.
2 B. La mayor parte del tiempo
1 C. Algunas veces
0 D. Nunca

3 A. Muy bien — 23.
2 B. Bastante bien
1 C. Solamente un poco bien
0 D. No me importaría

4 A. Muchísimo — 24.
3 B. Mucho
2 C. Un poco
0 D. De ningún modo

2 A. Mucho
1 B. Algunas veces
0 C. Rara vez
0 D. Nunca

3 A. Tratar bien fuerte
2 B. Tratar un poco fuerte
1 C. No me importaría
0 D. Tratar hacerlo mal

0 A. Cogerlo suave
1 B. Casarme
3 C. Consiguir un buen trabajo
4 D. Ir al colegio

3 A. Muy orgulloso
2 B. Bastante orgulloso
1 C. Un poquito orgulloso
0 D. No me importaría

3 A. Tratar mas fuerte
2 B. Pedir ayuda
1 C. Hacer otra cosa
0 D. No molestarme más

3 A. Terminarla lo mas pronto posible
1 B. Trabajar en ella cuando pueda
1 C. Terminarla al último minuto
0 D. Entregarla tarde

2 A. Siempre
1 B. Muchas veces
0 C. Rara vez
0 D. Nunca

1 A. Uso otra palabra
1 B. Adivino
2 C. Le pregunto a alguien
3 D. La busco en un diccionario

1 A. Estoy de acuerdo fuertemente
1 B. Estoy de acuerdo
2 C. Estoy en desacuerdo
3 D. Estoy en desacuerdo fuertemente

25. Cuando yo me agrande me gustaría ser ____

SCALE FOR SCORING ITEM NO. 25

ATTITUDE SCALE FOR BILINGUAL STUDENTS

Ranking of Occupations

Question No. 25: "When I grow up I want to be a _____?"

Rating	General Description	Subcategories and Examples
5	Highest Professional and Proprietary	Select Professionals: medical doctor, lawyer, scientist, university professor Proprietors of large businesses, executives and managers in large corporations High level public officials: president, governor, mayor, congressman, cabinet member, supreme court judge, etc.
4	Middle Professional and Proprietary	All professionals not included in 5 and not appropriate for 3: Teacher, policeman, pilot, detective, Architect, Dentist, Optomotrist, Fireman, Comissioned Officer, Engineer, Accountant, Veternarian, Journalist, Writer, News Reporter, account executive, etc. Proprietors of medium-sized businesses, executives, managers, labor union leaders Middle level public officials: city councilmen, assemblemen, police commissioner
3	Don't Know, etc.	
3	Clerical and Kindred Workers; Office Workers; "White-collared" Middle Class Occupations; and Small businessmen	Secretary, bank teller, assistant account executive, administrative assistant, etc. Low level public officials Proprietors of small businesses: grocery store owner, owner of funeral parlor, farmer, etc.
2	Skilled, Technical Workers/Craftsman	Aviation mechanic, draftsman, nurse, private dectective, non-commissioned military personnel, model, photographer, baseball player and other "stars," actress, undertaker, etc.
1	Semi-skilled and other Laborers	Taxi driver, auto mechanic, garbage man, housewife, beautician, clerk, typist, etc.
0	Frivolous Occupations	E.g., junkie, mujeriego, etc.

APPENDIX F

PROCEDURES EMPLOYED IN BOND AND SINGER METHOD

The Bond and Singer or "historical regression" approach employs the following sequence of computations:

1. Pretest grade equivalent scores are obtained for each pupil.

2. "1" is subtracted from each pupil's G.E. score (since grade equivalent scores start at 1.0 and not at zero).

3. The figure obtained in step 2 is divided by the number of months the pupil has been in school to obtain a hypothetical (historical regression) rate of growth per month. One school year equals ten months; kindergarten months are ignored.

4. The number of months of ESEA Title VII treatment is multiplied by the historical rate of growth per month.

5. The figure obtained in step 4 is added to the pupil's pretest grade equivalent score.

6. The difference for significance between the group of pupils' "expected" or "predicted" posttest means and the actual posttest means, is tested with a dependent or correlated t test.